DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 073 825 PS 006 125

TITLE	Spotlight on Day Care. Proceedings of the National Conference on Day Care Services (Washington, D.C., May 13-15, 1965).
INSTITUTION	Children's Bureau (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Child Welfare League of America, Inc., New York, N.Y.; National Committee for the Day Care of Children, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	66
NOTE	168p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (Children's Bureau Publication No. 438-1966, $0.55)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Child Care Centers; Child Care Workers; *Conference Reports; *Day Care Services; Disadvantaged Youth; Family Involvement; Handicapped Children; Parent Participation; Preschool Education; Preschool Programs; Program Administration; *Program Planning

ABSTRACT

The proceedings of the National Conference on Day Care Services are reported. Addresses before general sessions were: (1) "The Nation Looks at Day Care Services" by Hubert H. Humphrey; (2) "Spotlight on Day Care" by Ellen Winston; (3) "Education and Welfare: Allies Against Poverty" by Francis Keppel; (4) "Twenty Percent of the Nation" by Julius B. Richmond; and (5) "A Time for Action" by Abraham A. Ribicoff. Addresses before subconferences were: (1) "The Nation's Working Mothers and the Need for Day Care" by Mary Dublin Keyserling; (2) "The Meaning of Day Care for Business and Industry" by W. O. Heinze; (3) "The Meaning of Day Care for Labor" by Leo Perlis; (4) "The American Family--Image and Reality" by James R. Dumpson; (5) "Cognitive Development of Preschool Children in Culturally Deprived Families" by Robert D. Hes[illegible] (6) "A Spectrum of Services for Children" by Katherine B. Oettinger; (7) "Research Adds New Dimensions to Day Care Services for Children" by Milton J. D. Senn; and (8) "Organization Problems in Expanding Day Care Services" by John Neimeyer. The recommendations of the work groups concerned mobilizing the community, costs and financing day care, variety of day care services, parent involvement, administration, salary scales and personnel policies, staff for day care services, licensing and standards, and research. (KM)

ED 073825

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SPOTLIGHT ON

day care

PS 006125

proceedings of the
NATIONAL CONFERENCE on DAY CARE SERVICES

May 13-15, 1965

U.S. DEPARTMENT of HEALTH, EDUCATION, and WELFARE
WELFARE ADMINISTRATION • Children's Bureau

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

children's bureau publication number 438 - 1966

reprinted 1967

The National Conference on Day Care Services held in Washington, D.C. on May 13-15, 1965, was sponsored by the National Committee for the Day Care of Children, the Child Welfare League of America, in cooperation with the Children's Bureau, Welfare Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This publication gives a full report of the Conference proceedings--the preconference meeting, the addresses before the general sessions and the subconferences of the National Conference, and the recommendations of its workshops.

The participants in the Conference, in true democratic fashion, expressed their ideas and opinions freely. All their varying viewpoints--and there were many--are presented in this report.

Many people contributed to the success of the Conference. Only the contributions of a few--the Conference officers--can be listed here:

Leonard W. Mayo, S.Sc. D., Conference Chairman; President, International Union for Child Welfare, New York, New York

Mrs. Richard Lansburgh, Chairman, Program Planning Committee; Member, Board of Directors, National Committee for the Day Care of Children, Baltimore, Maryland

N. Eugene Otto, Chairman, Public Relations Committee; Public Relations Director, Potomac Electric Power Company, Washington, D.C.

Mrs. Charles G. Sunstein, Chairman, Invitations Committee; Member, Board of Directors, National Committee for the Day Care of Children, Elkins Park, Pennsylvania

Mrs. John A. Washington, Chairman, Local Arrangements Committee; Member, Board of Directors, National Committee for the Day Care of Children, Washington, D.C.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C., 20402 - Price 55 cents

CONTENTS

AN OVERVIEW OF THE CONFERENCE 1

PRECONFERENCE MEETING, May 13, 1965 6

ADDRESSES BEFORE GENERAL SESSIONS

The Nation Looks at Day Care Services
The Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey 19

Spotlight on Day Care
Ellen Winston 27

Education and Welfare: Allies Against Poverty
Francis Keppel 35

Twenty Percent of the Nation
Julius B. Richmond, M.D 41

A Time for Action
Senator Abraham A. Ribicoff 49

ADDRESSES BEFORE SUBCONFERENCES

Subconference A -- THE COMMUNITY MOBILIZES

The Nation's Working Mothers and the Need for Day Care
Mary Dublin Keyserling 63

The Meaning of Day Care for Business and Industry
W. O. Heinze 71

The Meaning of Day Care for Labor
Leo Perlis 77

Subconference B -- DAY CARE: ITS VALUES FOR THE FAMILY

The American Family -- Image and Reality
James R. Dumpson 89
Cognitive Development of Preschool Children in Culturally Deprived Families
Robert D. Hess 103

Subconference C -- WHERE IS THE CHILD?

A Spectrum of Services for Children
Katherine B. Oettinger 121
Research Adds New Dimensions to Day Care Services for Children
Milton J.D. Senn, M.D. 135

Subconference D -- ADMINISTRATION AND PERSONNEL

Organization Problems in Expanding Day Care Services
John Neimeyer 147

STATE AND CITY MEETINGS 153

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE WORK GROUPS 157

Mobilizing the Community 159

Costs and Financing Day Care 161

Variety of Day Care Services 161
For the culturally deprived 162
For the migrant family child 163
For the physically handicapped 163
For the emotionally handicapped 164
For the mentally retarded 165
For infants 166
For the child from 3 to 6 167
For the school age child 167

Parent Involvement 167

Administration, Salary Scales, and Personnel Policies 168

Staff for Day Care Services 169
For recruiting 170
For training and education 171
For volunteers 172

Licensing and Standards 172

Research 173

AN OVERVIEW OF THE CONFERENCE

THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON DAY CARE SERVICES, held May 13-15, 1965, under the auspices of the National Committee for the Day Care of Children, the Child Welfare League of America, and the Children's Bureau, came at a strategic moment in history.

Many people had come to realize that when children have unmet needs, the time wasted before meeting them can never be made up--and, perhaps what was even more important for this conference, the climate of the day was a fertile one for planting seeds of action.

The conference brought together more than 1,100 persons to discuss ways of stimulating day care services for all children who were in need of them. The participants included administrators, board members, proprietors and consumers of day care services, representatives of business and organized labor, and members of a variety of professional disciplines in the health, welfare, and educational fields.

The conferees met in plenary session, general sessions of 4 subconference groups, and in 24 work groups which, on one day, focused on specific topics and, on the next, on a roundup of the problems of States according to region, and of cities according to size.

Throughout the conference, testimony was repeatedly given to the inadequacy of day care as it now exists, and the great urgency for expansion of this service.

"Certain cultural attitudes" took the onus for the lag between need and services--the deeply ingrained feeling that mothers should stay at home with their children (unless they are threatened with public dependency) in a culture which depends on women workers for much of its prosperity.

Indirect evidence of "administrative barriers" to day care were apparent in the frequent calls for coordination heard from the platform and in discussion groups--coordination in planning, in financing, in interpretation, and in providing services. These were directed not only to the fund-providing and standard-setting Federal and State agencies, but also to the professions which provide the health, education, and welfare components of day care services and nursery schools. Services should be strong in all three components.

The family-centered focus of day care service and its nature as a supplement to family life was stressed again and again. Operators told of "reaching out" to involve reluctant parents in day care programs--as learners, as observers, and even as participants.

Repeated warnings were given, however, against expecting a day care service to accomplish miracles in the lives of children. More than day care is required for those whose lives are marked by "poor quality education, overcrowded dilapidated housing, poverty, poor physical and mental health, alienation from the larger community, humiliation and rejection based on ethnic considerations."

Project Head Start received much attention at the conference--both as an opportunity to expand preschool programs and as a threat to existing day care programs. The Office of Economic Opportunity would be making grants to about 2,600 communities for over 10,000 preschool programs involving about a half-million children. All agreed that those concerned with day care should cooperate in every way to help with these programs in order to get them on a sound base.

Operators of established services, however, were worried about what this expansion would mean in terms of competition for qualified staff, especially preschool teachers. In the long run, expansion of day care services would depend on ingenuity in recruiting, training, and use of staff. More training on the job, more intensive short-term courses, better supervision, and changing the traditional qualifications for trainees were suggested as ways that might be used in meeting personnel needs.

Others saw nonprofessional workers, whether paid or volunteer, as fitting almost everywhere in the program, but always under supervision. They saw sources of help in grandparents, in teenagers, in VISTA volunteers, in neighborhood mothers. High school graduates might be attracted to the program if educational opportunities leading to careers were made available. They might become a strong resource for future manpower for these programs.

Innovation and a reexamination of principles to open long closed doors to opportunities for children were strong underlying themes of the conference, especially in relation to children for whom day care services were all but lacking--infants and toddlers, school age children, children of migrants and of military personnel, and handicapped children.

One group spent some time discussing a type of service--group care of infants--once regarded as unthinkable by standard setting agencies. Family day care was still the method preferred by child welfare agencies for children under 3. The question was raised, however, as to whether this service could be expanded enough to meet the need. And, since many believed it could not, the group moved on to consider what safeguards could be built into group care for babies to protect them.

Family day care was also discussed as a possibility for school age children. After school group programs, with emphasis on recreation, received the most support. Both space and lack of community interest were mentioned as major problems in establishing such services. School buildings and grounds were identified as widespread, accessible and, except during school hours, largely unused resources.

Group day care for children with handicaps--physical, mental, or emotional--was a grave need, not only for the sake of the social and cognitive development of the children, but also to relieve the strain on their heavily burdened mothers. Special day care services, now rare, were called for as essential for the severely handicapped. At the same time, operators of regular day care services were urged to open their doors to the less severely handicapped and to prepare their staff and facilities for meeting their special needs. Parent counseling and teaching and flexible arrangements with other community services were essential for these services.

The culturally deprived child, noted as a special risk in regard to emotional, social, and cognitive development, was the target of the conferees' strong educational emphasis. Recent research points to a deficit in language development as a possible basic difficulty. Research coupled with new knowledge about the preschool child's readiness, even in infancy, to absorb the skills prerequisite for learning to read, write, and compute, underscored the importance of the educational component in day care centers. The conferees, however, were warned against putting too much faith in experience enrichment and stimulation as such, and told of research which indicates that what the child with a language deficit needs is not merely to learn "new words" but to be shown "how ideas and events are related to one another."

Two work groups called for the waiving of State residence laws which prevent children from receiving services, especially children of migrant agricultural workers and children of military personnel. The waiving of State laws prohibiting the group care of migrant children under 3 was also urged.

The importance of standards and of licensing in upholding and improving the quality of day care, whether offered on a commercial or nonprofit basis, was underlined. Standards were defined as the "ideal" in day care, and licensing as a way of working toward this ideal while, at the same time, protecting children, their parents, the operators of services, and the community.

Much of the misunderstanding that surrounds standards for day care services could be eliminated if operators and other community representatives were involved in their development.

In general, the conferees endorsed strong Federal, State, and local cooperation and urged agencies and civic groups to seek out new and creative methods to interpret the needs of day care to the public.

The double-barreled question "where and how to get funds" was the key to both expansion and improvement in day care services. The answers to where leaned heavily on the Federal Government, with State and local resources, public and voluntary, recognized in a somewhat less hopeful way. Present sources of Federal funds were pictured as promising "seed money" but confusing in their variety and differences in requirement.

The answers to the how part of the question were many but added up to two related forms of action: community mobilization and political action.

At the final session of the conference, Mrs. Randolph Guggenheimer, President of the National Committee for the Day Care of Children, summarized the recommendations of the 24 work groups. They coincided on their stress for coordination, the need for increased Federal funds, parent participation, community interpretation, better salaries, inservice and professional training, broadened representation on agency boards, the use of volunteers and other types of auxiliary personnel, and the formation of day care councils or local affiliates of the National Committee for the Day Care of Children.

On the last half day of the conference, the participants met in workshops centering around regional and city problems affecting day care for different population groups. In summarizing these workshop discussions, Mr. Leonard Mayo, President of the International Union for Child Welfare, and chairman of the conference, reported the participants as wanting:

- From the Federal Government, more clarification of policies; more data, guidelines, and consultation on standards and service operations, including up-to-date cost analysis figures; funds for construction of facilities; an open-end appropriation for child welfare services.

- From the States, area meetings to review State standards and legislation; efforts to strengthen State advisory committees through broadened representation; review and strengthening of State licensing laws.

- In localities, public agencies to investigate the purchase of day care services from private agencies on the basis of costs; and to establish central recruiting and training for day care personnel.

PS 000125

PRECONFERENCE MEETING

May 13, 1965

THE CHILDREN'S BUREAU sponsored a special 1-day preconference session prior to the National Conference on Day Care Services for discussion leaders of work group sessions. This session was held on May 13, 1965. Its purpose was to discuss the problems and prevalent attitudes about day care that seemed to be impeding the development of these services. Out of this discussion the Bureau hoped would come ways and means of helping participants in the National Conference to arrive at practical and effective plans for action.

The first part of the day was spent in discussing the subject matter to be covered in the National Conference and in clarifying questions that the discussion leaders had about the conference. The session gave them an opportunity to hear the points of view of other people on some of the questions they had about day care before facing their discussion groups.

The national picture on day care had changed completely in the preceding months. There were a number of new programs underway over the country that were closely related to, bordering on, if not constant with, day care. Some of them, for instance the Head Start program, were very recent developments. The work group leaders wanted to discuss these developments and to ask questions for which they needed answers before meeting with their discussion groups at the National Conference.

But before doing so, they wanted the purpose of the coming National Conference to be stated succinctly. The chairman of the preconference meeting, Mr. Leonard W. Mayo, pointed out that it could be stated simply as follows: "The purpose is to inform, to stimulate, and to develop."

Then he went on to explain these points further:

- "To inform one another, and when we get back home to inform our communities with respect to the purposes of day care and the need for day care in our respective communities.
- "To stimulate action back home in our communities around the day care objectives and goals.
- "And to develop new programs or to extend and strengthen existing programs wherever either or both are needed."

Mr. Mayo said that since he had been involved in helping to plan the National Conference, he had had a chance to test out what people--lay people particularly and many professional people also--think about day care and how they regard it. He had been astounded at the rather limited perception and narrow conception of the service.

In answering the question as to who was going to attend the National Conference, a member of the Children's Bureau staff pointed out that although some people from business, industry, labor, board members and lay people were expected, the majority of people coming would be from a variety of professional fields concerned with day care services.

Representatives from other governmental agencies, such as the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Department of Labor, and other constituent agencies of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such as the Office of Education and Public Health Service, would be attending. In addition, a few legislators were coming from several States.

The focus of the National Conference was clearly on children, but a consideration of the needs of other ages was not excluded. Indeed, it would be impossible to discuss children as though they existed in a separate small world or had no families or elderly relatives to take care of them.

One discussion leader drew a curve on the blackboard. He said if we take "age" for one dimension and the capacity for independence for another, whether this be for work or play or vocational activity or for any other realm of human endeavor, we begin at zero as an infant and gradually go up until we reach a zenith at some point. Then the curve drops off until we come back to zero again. We begin as completely dependent individuals and we end up as completely dependent individuals. "So for this reason day care of the aged was an area which needed consideration, if not at this conference than at some future time."

The discussion leaders agreed that there was an amazing dearth of understanding of the need for day care and of what facilities as a nation we have, or lack, to meet it.

In some ways, day care is one of the most controversial issues in the social and economic life in the United States, with resistances coming from many different areas--religious objections, fear that day care will destroy family life, the resistance to the "babysitting" concept. The hundreds--or, at least, a dozen major forces, including professionals fighting with each other--make it very difficult for concerted community action.

One participant pointed out that, at a meeting of child psychiatrists or social workers, conceivably you might run into the kind of individual who has such precise and particular standards for day care that nowhere in the United States is there a satisfactory program. That's one kind of argument. This comes up in every community. Often it is a major roadblock--the overprofessionalization of child care. To discuss day care with people with a certain level of sophistication and theoretical bias is one thing. To discuss day care with a city councilman or taxpayer is quite another. In the latter instance, the question may boil down to why should we provide for care for children of 2 years of age, since it will be 20 years before the child shows up in the jail as a problem anyway. So why bother? The long time lag between what we are concerned with now and the ultimate effect in the lives of children--how do you get that across?

There is an enormous growth of day care now under other names. We have Head Start programs, community action programs, nursery schools, child development centers. The National Conference would need to come up with some recommendations of how day care will relate to and be a part of this enormous growth of preschool programming--which is day care in a very real sense.

While all group leaders at the preconference were fully agreed that the professional people know what day care is in their own minds, and certainly in their own disciplines, they were not sure professional people know how to communicate this even to other professional disciplines.

Do we believe that day care should be available for all children, or only for those with special labels, such as the culturally deprived, the handicapped, those with working mothers, and so on? What are the types and variety of services needed to meet the day care needs of all age groups?

The conferees agreed that implicit in all these questions--if they were to be thoroughly discussed at the National Conference--is another: What strategy is needed to integrate day care services into the permanent fabric of American life? What is the respective responsibility of the various levels of government in the development of services? Federal, State and local, public and voluntary?

As discussion leaders, they wanted to get across to the participants in the National Conference the value of day care for families and, consequently, it was hoped that the recommendations coming from the discussion groups would show what day care can do for a child beyond custodial and protective care.

At this point, one discussion leader said she would like to raise a protest: "I think being alive is a problem today. I think to shortcut the vision of the relation of day care to a family, as a focus on the family problem, is a distortion of the intent of the major leadership in day care."

Another conferee said that an argument could be made that the care provided by most middle class mothers for their infants is far from optimal since no serious study has been done of stimulatory needs of children at various ages. Conceivably, the functional level of intelligence of American middle class children might be increased by 50 percent with optimum stimulation.

One discussion leader wanted to get down to cases--the purposes and goals of day care. The first purpose might be biological: the care, feeding, protection, shelter, clothing, nutrition, environment, and so forth, of children.

The second might be the creativity or stimulatory experience that every child and dependent individual needs. This would include accessibility to books, objects, music, stories, and to other experiences.

Third might be the education of the child. If the focus was placed here, much of the prejudice or negative feelings about day care might be overcome.

A fourth focus or purpose might be to provide the child with models. One of the facts of day care is that the children in these centers are very often children from fatherless homes. They get into a day care center and here, again, they are taken care of by mothers and female workers. Nowhere in their realm of experience are they exposed to any kind of male figures. One of the issues in terms of providing models is, hopefully, to provide a male model or male figure that these children could use in their growth.

Fifth, the focus of day care has to be around the family--strengthening the family image. We still believe, in our society, in the promise of the family. True, some of its functions are being taken away--the economic, perhaps the spititual, perhaps the educational. But one thing the family can still provide is the interpersonal needs of the child, whether he be in the day care center or in the home.

A sort of "economic ghetto" has been set up around day care, and this seems a great disservice to children. Many children in a middle class economic situation desparately need day care services--just as desparately as children of the poor. They are the forgotten children. Day care is a service their parents cannot pay for privately and cannot qualify their children for through publicly supported services. All of those interested in day care should not be timid in pushing for much larger programs all over the country and for many more kinds of children.

It ought to be reiterated that day care involves a whole range of services, public and voluntary. Voluntary day care facilities have been available a long time for the upper income groups, and they do need them judging from the fact that they use them. This they must do because they find their children profiting from them.

Those work groups that are responsible for such things as manpower really ought to keep in mind some of the special types of children needing day care, of which the delinquent child is one. Day care offers one of the most promising alternatives to institutionalization for the delinquent child who needs treatment and yet, hopefully, might be retained in the community and treated there. The culturally deprived, the physically handicapped, the emotionally handicapped, and the mentally retarded are other examples of children and youth with special needs for day care and who have special requirements in regard to staff with special skills.

Most of the day care thinking of the various professions seems to be oriented to the idea of seeing themselves in the role of providers, and the families who use day care as recipients or, perhaps as people who are being treated. Do we need, to some extent at least, to reorient our thinking and consider parents as participants with the professionally trained worker, or as potential participants?

At this point, the group leaders began talking about the strategy of advance--a very difficult area. Some participants leaned strongly toward ending the concept of day care as such and moving toward a concept of providing care for all children and for all families who have need of such care, whatever it may be. The country, as a whole, simply does not realize the tremendous shortages in all the services for all children and for all families. As people concerned with day care, we stand less chance of succeeding, both organizationally and administratively, if we try to identify what looks like one saleable segment. As long as we keep looking at the care of children in such a segmented way, we are always patching up something.

There is a job here of helping the whole country realize how very little we are spending as a nation on what is a basic notion--that is, that every family needs supplementation, that no family at any point in its development can ever function alone. Yet we have never, in any civic sense, organized to give whatever supplementation every family is going to need.

One participant went so far as to say in relation to strategy: "Day care is doomed so long as it does not relate itself to the wider concept of all the supplementation that all families require."

Is it not true that day care is a preventive service--one of the more important preventive services? If this is true, and it can be proven in any way, then why do we shy away from the concept of universal provision?

The difficult task remains of persuading the public that it has a responsibility to be concerned with the development of children. This responsibility must be in terms of the most effective means available at any particular time for meeting children's needs. This may require investing at 10, 20, or 100 times the present rate.

Out of these broad concepts, though interesting and sometimes even true, must come the specifics for action for the National Conference. How could the participants in the National Conference take heart from this statement for what should be done next year?

Another conferee believed that the main purpose of the National Conference should be to pinpoint where unmet needs exist, how communities can go about collecting evidence in regard to such unmet needs and, then, use the evidence to develop services.

The group agreed that day care should be available for all children who need it, and that there are plenty of children in our country right now who need day care services who are not getting them at all, or not getting them in decent quality, or are getting them under makeshift circumstances or arrangements. Perhaps the National Conference should concentrate, at least to some extent, on certain priorities of needs and should do this quite clearly. If the National Conference got into a controversial area on the all or none principle, the Conference might end up with nothing constructive at its close.

Another group leader suggested two points that ought to be borne in mind in anything coming out of the National Conference.

First, "We don't want to sell the legislators or the public in terms of something we cannot deliver." This has happended to the social welfare movement repeatedly. The effort to gain a success causes promises to be offered; then the demand for calling in the IOU's occurs; then, "We can't deliver all we said we could." This is most regrettable.

Second, the opportunities provided by the moment should be welcomed, even though they force us to prepare "larger battle strategies" to achieve "moments of the future at the same time."

One participant said that he did not want to sound like a purist with respect to quality, but "there is a great deal of feeling around, you know, that something is better than nothing, and this just isn't true." Something may be worse than nothing if these programs aren't decently manned and adequately managed. We have to combat this because of the idea that is so current of "let's get these kids together and just put them in a group and get some adults and let's go."

When children are brought together in a group, regardless of why they are in the group, the quality of their living must be as high, as rich, and as good as it can possibly be.

The Head Start program is stressing quality of personnel, but the idea of a group of 15 children with three adults, one of whom is trained, seems an amazing standard to be able to establish at this point for a program that will try to encompass 500,000 children next year.

Those concerned with day care have to sell not only the program but also the long-term nature of the expected results. In other words, Head Start may accomplish a few miracles in 2 months or in 2 years, but there are going to be few of them compared to the large number of children who will be involved. We have to prepare ourselves, and the people that we are aiming these programs toward, to think in much longer-range terms.

One of the contributions of Head Start might very well turn out to be the coining of the term "child development center." It is a way of circumventing past associations with nursery education or day care by trying to focus on the youngsters who are in the center and what they need because they are there.

The people in the preconference concluded that day care of children includes a wide variety of arrangements which parents choose for the care of their children, of whatever age, during the day. This concept encompasses individual attention in such facilities as family day care homes, in group care, in day care or child development centers, nursery schools, kindergartens, before and after school programs, all day programs in the summer and during school vacations, regardless of name, purpose, or auspices. Good day care provides educational experiences and guidance, health services, and makes social services available as needed by the child and his family. It safeguards children and helps the parents maintain the values of enriched family life.

If, as sponsors of day care programs, we ask ourselves the question, "How could we demonstrate the effect on the child of a 2-month program or a 10-month program or a full-year program?, then once this question is asked, we are forced to concern ourselves with the method of measurement in relationship to the things that are attempted. When you try to measure something, you have to specify it in a much more precise way than "improving health," "nurturing children," or some global and very nonspecific definition.

The next question then becomes: What are we trying to do in terms of what we can measure? Not that we are limited to what we can do, but it is one of the things we have to consider.

Take a concrete example that may clarify this point. Now when these youngsters arrive at school, the ones in the underprivileged groups do not even know how to listen. One very reasonable and feasible and demonstrable goal would be to find a way of measuring the children's ability to attend responsively to speech. To do this, the nursery school teacher or day care program director has to be instructed that one of the goals is to teach children to listen. How do you do that?

One thing is clear. Meeting children's need for care is not just a matter of gathering children together, providing adults to look after them, and hoping life will take over. Some guidelines are required as to what the center is trying to do, and how measures can be designed that are feasible to use in measuring what is accomplished within the time. This is one of the most effective ways of getting people to consider the fundamentals of a program.

On an entirely different level, there are other easily understandable, and far more easily researchable, results such as the reduction of absenteeism of the mother who is able to accept employment because of day care. Also, simple social goals must be established that are understandable. Often these goals relate more to the social result than to the development of the child.

There is a fine line and a nice balance between insisting that day care groups follow a certain structural rigidity on the one hand, and allowing them to go off in all directions on the other.

One of the many things that various countries in Europe have contributed to our culture in the field of child care is the abandon with which they set up and experiment with various types and forms of care. This is true of Holland, the Scandinavian countries, to some extent Russia, and in certain other countries where they have a great number of child care arrangements--ranging from the orthodox foster home, as we know it, to the orthodox institution, as we know it. There are small group homes. There are homes in the same town where a cottage mother and father, as we would call them, care for half a dozen emotionally disturbed children, some of whom may go to school or be tutored or work in the community. Such countries have all manner of interim arrangements, and no one says, "What is that? Is it a foster home? Is it an institution? Is it a small group?" They don't try to tag it. They just do it.

The conferees talked about the need for a simple type of communication between the disciplines and also between people in the community, since often people who have to carry the program really don't understand many of the complex things that professional people talk about.

One conferee made a plea for focusing on the value of communication in program building and, in addition to this, as a general principle, mentioned that one technique which seems to be valuable in carrying programs to a community is to involve people from the communications media on the planning committees--not just to cover a specific program in the press or on the radio and television, but also to be very knowledgeable about the grass root needs of the particular type of service which is being considered.

Another thought it was unfortunate that the group leaders were spending so much time on Head Start because it deflected them from the major purposes of the National Conference. Although Head Start and the other components of the Economic Opportunity Act may furnish leverage whereby new programs can get underway, by the same token, there are components of day care--the Appalachia Act, the Manpower Training Act, and the Education Act--that can be utilized to do this also.

Perhaps the search for reasons to erase the distinction between day care and preschool education may be an unnecessary exercise. The more important objective may be related to the possibility that both be planned together. That is, there should be a single plan as to the needs for day care service and preschool education for the community or region or State. Planning and development of both types of service need to be done on a unitary basis, and beyond that, Federal funds and the next steps which may come in the financing of these services should begin to be looked at together. That is, the financing of day care and of preschool education should begin to be looked at together.

Day care is suffering from the fact that agencies have been fractioning the service. They have centered their interest on one aspect of child development to the neglect of others. To get them to change is difficult.

This is not just a paper issue. Educators have their investments in the care of children; social workers have theirs. People in the nursing field have their own, and so on and so forth. It is no simple job to get them to go together on a given program for a given locality.

What we call Head Start is undoubtedly a temporary measure. Those concerned with day care have to think about where in the future they would like this satellite to land and how it can be attached to the community. Their task is to build up community understanding, acceptance, and support for these programs--and then to consider how they can become an integral part of community services for children for the future.

The chairman, in closing the preconference session, stated that he became a little uncomfortable at the use of the word "sell" because we are doing something more fundamental and important than selling. We are presenting the people in this country with some terribly disturbing facts about our culture and our society. This is no superficial attempt to get quick approval. This is a long-term and serious job of confronting, first, ourselves and, second, the people with whom we are working on day care, with highly disturbing and important facts about our life, the way we regard children in our society, and the extent to which adequate child care is not yet accepted as an integral part of our culture.

Whereupon the preconference meeting was adjourned.

ADDRESSES BEFORE GENERAL SESSIONS

THE NATION LOOKS AT DAY CARE SERVICES

THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY Vice President of the United States

WE START DEVELOPING the kind of young men and women we want at an extremely early age. You people are in the work of the conservation and development of human resources. We need to get the message to the world that this great nation is even more concerned about the real wealth of the nation, the individual, the spirit, mind and body of the people. It is a part of the democratic institution to contribute to the enrichment of the life of the individual, the release of potentialities of the intellect.

We must keep in mind what our true goals and objectives are, and then we will be able to assign proper priorities in our daily work, our national programs and policies. Make no mistake; if this nation of ours is to maintain its role of world leadership--a mantel which was placed on our shoulders without our consent--we must have strength in depth. We cannot afford the luxury of the abuse or neglect of body or mind. The greatest deficit in human development is not the fiscal deficit, but the human deficit. The surest way to keep our budgets in balance and to meet international commitments is to see that minds, souls, and bodies are in balance, that individuals have a sense of personal fulfillment. This is a goal that can be achieved.

You are here for a noble work. You are here at exactly the right moment. The Congress are your friends because you elected them. They are here to listen to you. When everybody is clamoring for their attention, you might just as well join in the clamor and be heard. Come as a friend of the people--as a friend of the little ones. If you come as a friend of the child, you will not only be heard but gladly received. Speak softly, kindly, but speak up for God's greatest creation, the child.

We are coming to grips with tomorrow's America. We have experts on yesterday's America. But I would like to ask you to be a prophet, a builder, rather than a recorder. It is well to study history, but it is really more important to make history. You can do it now. We can make this a turning point in the relationship of society to the individual, by thinking of mothers and children in the communities where they live.

This rich nation still has a conscience. We could have been without one. Most of our people are getting along pretty well. The real test of a society is its concern for the least of these, its concern for the few who are left behind.

It is not good enough to judge our society on statistical evidence. We must be thinking about what a democratic society should be thinking about--the well-being of the individual.

If anything in our modern lexicon bothers me, it is the word "mass." When we start averaging out people and considering them in the mass, we have destroyed personality. We must be interested in every person, not only here but all over the world. Let this understanding be not only for us but for everybody. Let everyone know that we are interested in people--in their health, education, physical and emotional well-being, and in their cultural well-being. We must be identified with people.

If anything disturbs me, it is to see how those who really do not have any regard for individual personality have usurped the words of our faith. We read about the Peoples Republic of this and that--of North Korea and of East Germany. But there, people are not considered, and it is not a republic, and it is not a democracy.

We forget that we are the people and that our whole faith and history is embedded in the word "people." We are the republic. We are democratic.

Being a democracy imposes a tremendous responsibility upon us. It does not mean we have fulfilled every goal but that we continue to try; we are always beginning, always starting, always pushing forward.

Day care has a very direct relationship to these principles. The availability of modern day care services is no longer an individual convenience. It is a community and a national necessity, particularly for larger numbers of people in our factories and shops--working mothers. Some people say they shouldn't be working. I've been brought up to believe that what is, is.

One out of every four mothers with children under 6 is in the labor force. The number has doubled since 1950. It is now 3,600,000. By 1970, the number of working mothers of preschool age children will have increased by 43 percent. That is the projection. A wise community or nation is the one which tries to plan ahead, to look ahead at what it needs. The needs of our children for too long have been greater than the nation's response.

The average expenditure for a child in public school is $450 a year. If he is a delinquent, it goes up to $1,800. If he is on relief, it is $2,500. If he is "lucky" enough to go to jail, it is $3,500. There is something wrong here. The cost of crime, the cost of delinquency, the cost of hopelessness--those are the costs America ought to be concerned about. Instead of always worrying, we might begin to spend a little extra to improve education, cultural activities, wholesome recreation. Those are investments, and they yield dividends better than A.T. and T.--and that is pretty good.

Good public day care centers are investments, but they are too few. We know they yield dividends. You would think when you know what the return is going to be that a practical people would continue to make investments. When you see a stock going up and you don't make the investment if you have the resources, you would have to be tagged as a fool, or you could be one of those who just doesn't care about investments.

We have positive evidence that programs of education in child care centers and nursery schools yield a reward: a better student, a healthier mind, a better citizen. Public day care centers, in spite of this evidence, are still far too few. They are so jammed with applicants that they can only accept the poverty stricken or one parent families. We should not have to live in a society where the only way of receiving the social services needed is to become totally poverty stricken.

If you can just get your neighborhood broken down, make it a dump, we can rebuild it for you. Now we are beginning to understand that many people love their neighborhoods and with a little rehabilitation, these neighborhoods can be saved before they become slums. With better foresight, we can save some neighborhoods. We can also help people before they hit derelict row.

Thanks to the 1962 Public Welfare Amendments and to Federal, State, and local initiative, services have been expanded and we are improving standards, but we have a long way to go. At least we have made a start. As the President said only yesterday, we may start and we may fall flat on our faces, but we will get up again and start again. Surely you will occasionally falter, but I am sure you will just get up again and move ahead.

Consider the plight of 12½ million children in the 3 to 5 age span. There is no group in our entire population except infants up to 3 who can benefit more from our creative attention. It is then that we can bring beauty into the life of the child.

I am suspicious of surveys but they are markers; they give us some indication of what is going on. In families where there are working mothers, 48 percent of the 3 to 5 year olds are cared for in their own homes, 27 percent in other homes, and 25 percent through other arrangements. Only 7 percent of these children are in day care centers.

These facts confirm that we are far behind many other countries in the western world in providing adequate day care services. I think these are facts you all know, but I am an old teacher. Education is primarily saturation, repetition, and, for some of us, just plain osmosis.

When American mothers work, their thoughts must anxiously turn to the well-being of their children. We are well aware of the physical tragedy that can befall children when they are improperly cared for, but far more widespread is the intangible harm of arrested intellectual growth.

The minds of children must be challenged and encouraged to grow. They cannot grow in an atmosphere of monotony, boredom, and with nothing to do. That is why we are starting this new Head Start program for our children--the denied child and the deprived child.

Experts in child development and nursery school education can bring the child to the world and the world to the child. We must bring each child to the world and identify each child as an individual with a particular ability and interest. We must encourage each to develop at an appropriate pace along with his or her own individual lines. We are not all alike. We are beginning to understand that we must pay more attention to individual differences. Gifts are different in development and in time. Children do not all bloom at the same time, at the same pace, and under the same circumstances.

We need more trained personnel. We need people who are concerned and really love children. They need to be highly respected for their technical competence.

The teacher works with our most precious possession. We talk of love and respect for the mother and this is a good moral and emotional standard. If we can just get the body politic to have a profound respect for those who work with our children and compensate them accordingly, then I will believe that we are really interested in helping the child.

Our children deserve the best, but this is not pampering; it is helping, educating, caring. Today's parents are entitled to realize their aspirations. Today's women are entitled to realize their fullest potential.

America needs more from its women. There is so much women can give to the common good--in medicine, the arts, a host of professions. They should be able to realize their potentialities as mothers, yes, and as citizens also.

It is easy to say that if a mother fears for her children, she should not work. But that is easier said than done. Eighty-six percent of working mothers are working out of economic necessity. But the complaints against them come from somebody who doesn't have to work and doesn't understand the circumstances.

We have been talking about children of working mothers, but there are other children who need day care--the handicapped, physically, mentally, and emotionally. Or those from homes so poverty stricken they can only offer misery. Here's where we can really do a job.

There is a common denominator in the eye of the child of the poverty stricken. There is a look of sadness. Such sadness and yet such basic beauty.

I urge you all to go to the Smithsonian Institution and look at the photographic exhibit of the poverty stricken. I asked for this exhibit. For the limited time it will be on display, I would like the well-fed, well-healed, and well-paid American to know what the other side of America looks like.

There are unbelievable areas of great misery in our own country. We don't have to go to the great cities in other countries, like Cairo and Caracas, to find some pretty sad children. I have seen them in Harlem and in the hills of Kentucky and West Virginia.

They can't do much about such misery in other countries. They don't have the means, but we do. We will not be forgiven for our failure to act to do something when we can. Our only decision in America is the will. We have the people, the resources. We have the know-how. You just have to make up your mind what you want to do. You just have to make the decision to do it.

We have such incredible power! If we have unlimited resources to defend freedom all over the world, we have unlimited resources to work for people right here in our own beloved United States.

Day care is not a limited concept; it is not just for low income families and working mothers. It is for the child who needs it, and for the length of time he needs it.

The sponsoring organizations for this conference should be thanked, for you are leading the way--the National Committee for the Day Care of Children, the Child Welfare League of America, and the Children's Bureau.

The time is ripe. Here, in 1965, wouldn't it be wonderful if we in America proclaimed to the world that this is Children's Year?

You have heard about Operation Head Start. Now we are going to start Operation "Catch Up" for those who have been denied a chance throughout their lives. We are going to spend a considerable sum of money--conscience money in a real sense.

I want to tell you that, other than President Johnson himself, the person who had the most to do with getting this program started was the former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Anthony J. Celebrezze.

The wonderful thing about our program is that children can catch up. They heal quickly; they change quickly.

I am confident that the Children's Bureau will increase its capacity to expand day care if you really go to work. There is nothing wrong about lobbying. I advise you to be a lobbyist. Go up to Capitol Hill and lobby your heads off.

The Office of Economic Opportunity will fulfill its mandate to break the poverty cycle among deprived children. But whenever you start a new program, you have 45 analysts per square foot telling you what's wrong with it.

We do not believe that we can heal the wounds of poverty overnight. They are like abscesses, like malignancies. They can't be cured by superficial treatment in a moment. But the longest journey starts with a single step. We are taking this now. Next year, we will take the second step, and the next, the third, and then we will stand up with our heads high and work to rid this country of one pocket of poverty after another. We consider this a war we can win. This is a war we ought to escalate. We ought to be dropping all kinds of bombs--day care, health care, education, psychological care, psychiatric therapy. We can do it!

The poverty war is going better than people think. In this war, we recognize that day care services must be strengthened so that parents can get job training.

There have been complaints about community action programs. We believe these programs must be conducted where the people are. We will make mistakes, but we will learn from them. It is important not to become so discouraged that we see only the scratches on the mighty oak and never the strength of the tree.

The poverty of hopelessness is most serious. It is terrible to feel not wanted, to be told there is no place for you, to sit in the back of the bus, to know there is no job for you, and if there is a job you won't get the same pay. This is the kind of poverty we are fighting.

We need to shake people up. We need to talk of people as people--as Americans--and drop "regardless of race, creed, or color."

Operation Head Start is an unprecedented assault on the deprivation of youth. It is going so fast the critics can't catch up with it. The dividends from Operation Head Start are not just to the children but to the adults.

We are going to try a lot of new things, and we will take some risks. More dividends are coming out of Operation Head Start than out of anything we have ever done. If you want to be safe and secure, just stand still. Of course, you will miss the whole world, but you will be safe.

We know that what you want from your government is encouragement, knowledge, know-how, coordination, financial resources. But Government doesn't do everything. Government is a part of our society. It is the people doing something for themselves and working through the Government that will bring the child out of hiding.

I'm going to leave you with a few axioms.

The child who feels left out today may very well be the dropout tomorrow. The child who is alienated from his family today is much less likely to find his place in our society.

The child needs strength to lean on, a shoulder to cry on, and an example to learn from. Let us give children their due. Let us build for tomorrow by enriching their lives today.

SPOTLIGHT ON DAY CARE

ELLEN WINSTON Commissioner of Welfare, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

I WELCOME YOU here tonight with a feeling of excitement and anticipation, for during the life of this conference, and during the months and years that follow, each of you assembled in this hall will be making history.

It will be important history--not the humdrum of daily events--but the significant actions which can help to shape the future of our society and to make life better for hundreds of thousands of children.

I am sure that you would not have come to Washington this week if you did not share this conviction.

It is fitting to begin my address to you with a quotation which some of you may recall from an earlier day--"That this Nation cannot afford day care is nonsense. It cannot afford not to afford it and it can afford what it chooses to afford."[1]

---

[1] Hoffman, Gertrude L. [Compiler]: DAY CARE SERVICES: Form and Substance--A Report of a Conference, November 17-18, 1960. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, [Welfare Administration]. Children's Bureau Publication 331. Washington, D.C. 20402: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961. 55 pp. (p. 41.)

That was the gauntlet which Judge Robert W. Landry of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, flung at the delegates who attended the National Conference on Day Care for Children held less than 5 years ago.

How much has happened since then! Then, there was no spotlight on day care. Then, the dedicated group which sought to carve out the very deepest meanings of good day care--from financing to standards to programs themselves--were trying to build, almost from scratch, the effort to help the children of working mothers which largely collapsed after World War II.

The need was clearly there. It had never ceased. Women were working in increasing numbers then; their numbers are still increasing.

But those delegates to the 1960 Conference on Day Care were handicapped. They saw the need for day care services, but the average citizen did not. They saw the dangers to children if adequate day care services were not provided, but the average citizen did not. None of us knows today what price our society has paid because children, in their formative years, did not get the day care services they needed even during this brief span of time.

But far more people now, than in 1960, know that it is a price we can no longer afford to pay. So tonight, we meet in a different and infinitely more favorable climate.

Let us make the most of this climate--this national increase in interest in good day care programs.

Let us here and now accept the challenge that, if there is to be another National Conference on Day Care 5 years from now, it need not concern itself with the need for more day care services, but rather can proceed with energy, experience, and intelligence to apply all the new and ingenious ways to provide children with the services which will have been developed in the meantime.

Let us hope that by then, as the spotlight moves with the pace of change which our rapidly changing world demands, we can gather our forces anew to assure the precious individuality of each child in whatever setting he grows up in our great Nation.

That precious individuality is underscored by the impressive program we are about to undertake. It also indicates what a broad span of interests is represented in this distinguished group.

Some of us are here because we want to be sure that the mentally retarded child gets his clear, best chance to benefit from day care services when they can be of the most benefit, not only to him but to his family.

Some of us are here because we feel strongly that children in one age range or another need to be singled out for special attention; we believe that they must not be forgotten.

Some of us are here because we see this as a golden opportunity to spell out, in clarion voice, the stakes that industry, business, and labor have in good day care programs.

Some of us are here as administrators of programs, with special needs to be met if good standards are not only to be established, but improved and strengthened.

Each of us, then, has his own special interest, but we meet in common purpose.

I believe that this common purpose can best be served if, during the course of this conference, we produce a whole new compendium of the rights of the child for adequate day care services as a way of strengthening and preserving family life. But this will not be enough for this conference to accomplish. We must be sure that the community of interest established here will spread to every city, town, and hamlet to produce programs of sure and purposeful action which will accomplish our highest goal: adequate day care services for every child who needs them.

It would not have been possible 5 years ago to suggest to a group of people dedicated to the advancement of day care that they could look toward the achievement of such a goal within the foreseeable future.

But much has happened since then.

You are all familiar with the provisions of the Public Welfare Amendments to the Social Security Act, passed in 1962, which gave particular emphasis, plus specific financial backing, to the expansion of State programs for the day care of children. The emphasis in these amendments, quite properly, was concerned with helping children of the lower income groups. More recently, with the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act, Federal aid has been authorized to stimulate preschool children from deprived homes so that they will be better prepared for classroom study when they reach school age.

Even before the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act, three national groups with a great stake in the future of today's generation of children--and each generation yet to come--had already agreed that a National Conference on Day Care Services must be called to build on the basic groundwork of the 1962 amendments in providing day care services, not only to children in low income families, but to all children who might benefit from them.

This coalition of the public and voluntary sector--represented by the Child Welfare League of America and the National Committee for the Day Care of Children, in cooperation with the Children's Bureau, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare--recognized what a unique opportunity lay within their grasp if they could build on the standard setting provisions of the 1962 Public Welfare Amendments in encouraging day care programs for all children who needed them.

Those of you who participated in the early planning stages for this conference know what thorny issues the program planning committee had to grapple with before they could even set the conference stage.

They were very realistic in appraising the problems they faced. One of these was that there is a tremendous sociological lag in the country between reality and what the average citizen believes about working mothers. The reality is that women are working in ever-increasing numbers, but far too many of our citizens just won't face this fact and they act as though the working woman is a rarity.

The reality is that the role of the mother with children under 6 years of age has changed, but many people still think that the mother of the 1960's carries out the same function as the mother of the 1900's who spent her days in the kitchen baking gingerbread for her children, washing their clothes, and keeping their rooms clean with her carpet sweeper.

Some women are fearful that if adequate day care services become available, they would feel under pressure to go to work, when the fact is that day care is a supplement to parental care, not a substitute for it, and that it should be available to children who need it.

Another myth that the program planners faced was that day care is a service needed only by children who come from inadequate homes or have inadequate parents. All these myths--these misunderstandings, these lags between reality and public understanding--were discussed, argued about in weeks and months of careful thought over the best way to approach the conference participants with the most meaningful program to insure community action.

It was in connection with one of the myths about day care that I felt it necessary to take action within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This is the myth that day care is a program for 3- to 6-year-old children--that it does not include infants, toddlers, and school age children. Day care, as a service for children from infancy into the school years, is a unique service. It cannot and should not be confused with nursery school and kindergarten programs which are essentially for the preschool child.

But it seemed important to be sure that this distinction was made clear while, at the same time, reiterating that health, education, and welfare are all essential components of all programs for our young children.

It was with this idea in mind that I approached Commissioner Francis Keppel of the Office of Education, requesting a memorandum of agreement which would clearly differentiate between the aims of the two programs.

Many of you may not be aware that such memoranda of agreement are frequently drawn at the Federal level of administration to be sure that there is no duplication in program goals. These memoranda are developed primarily for the use and guidance of the Federal agencies in clarifying their responsibilities. Of course, it is also important that those dealing with the Government know what the Federal policies are. Communities and groups seeking grants for special children's programs need to know the responsibility of each Federal agency. The memorandum made clear that day care services are a part of child welfare services, and that preschool education is a part of educational programs provided for children. It also made it clear that day care programs do not end at a specific time in the life of a child.

Briefly, the day care definition was: "Adequate care and protection of children in day care must combine the services of health, education, and welfare--services fundamental to the growth and development of the child. The essential function of day care is to give care and protection to children as a supplement to parental care."

The nursery school definition: "The essential function and purpose of preschool education is the training, education, and development of the child."

Further, we jointly stated: "The purposes and reasons for which a child and family need and use the service distinguish a day care service from educational programs, which are generally referred to as nursery school and kindergarten."

A statement drawn up by the Office of Economic Opportunity further outlines the differences in function between day care and nursery school programs: "The differences in function and purpose do have some impact on administrative considerations. Day care centers usually offer services throughout the whole of the work day and the entire work year. This long-day schedule arises because the center is serving in lieu of the mother who is not able to care for her young children at home. In contrast, the preschool program assumes that the child comes from and can return to a home which has much to offer him. Thus, preschool programs frequently are half-day, morning or afternoon, although they sometimes coincide with the usual full school day."

I mention these developments because it seems to me that all of them have a bearing on the conference purposes. We do not need to waste our time on defining day care services.

What we most earnestly must do is to develop ways to broaden the base of community participation and interest in the establishment of adequate day care services.

The Children's Bureau has indicated that it can use to the fullest the $7 million which the Congress is now considering as an appropriation for extending day care services during fiscal year 1966.

But you and I know that this is "seed" money. It can help to initiate and stimulate day care services. It cannot possibly provide an adequate financial basis for them in any sector of our great country.

But this is no reason for discouragement. You know that the Children's Bureau and all of us in the Welfare Administration stand pledged to support your own efforts in every possible way, through consultation and standard setting, as you move to achieve the reality of all our dreams.

That reality will come about only as every community, of whatever size, takes an honest look at its own stake in day care services. There is no segment in any community which does not have this stake--business and industry, which need women to maintain their operations and who have a responsibility to see to it that the children of working mothers get day care. These community leaders must become active in supporting day care programs.

These are the people who innovate to keep up with changes in the business economy, who seek the best minds to encourage the expansion of their interests, and who use these minds to further community interest in day care programs.

For certainly, as we all recognize that we live in a nuclear society--with a nuclear family split away from its traditional roots--the responsible elements in the community must assume a new role, must again be innovators, in providing those supportive elements to maintain the greatest tradition in our whole civilization: the preservation of family life.

Voluntary agencies, many of whom are represented here tonight, can have a tremendous effect on community movement toward the provision of adequate day care, and I know that you will carry forward that role with all the vigor at your command. We must look at our communities in a new light. In our great cities and in our bustling suburbs throughout the country, there are people with vision and determination to build the physical elements which show national growth.

We must find the people with vision and determination to help us build the social elements which can prevent the physical growth of our nation from being wasted because children didn't have the chance to which every child is entitled--to develop a healthy personality so that his contribution to our society is truly meaningful.

I have great faith in you, as individuals, to carry forward these purposes. Perhaps I should not remind you--for I know it is a painful thought we already share--that the longer adequate day care services are delayed, the more we discriminate against our nation's children.

Discrimination is a beginning--not an end. It can lead to incalculable wastes to society.

But this conference, too, is a beginning--not an end.

Together, we can fulfill its great promise. Together, united in our common cause, we can make day care programs an accepted, integral part of life in every community.

This is the job ahead. Let us get on with it.

EDUCATION AND WELFARE: ALLIES AGAINST POVERTY

FRANCIS KEPPEL Commissioner of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

IT IS A PRIVILEGE to be here with you at this National Conference on Day Care Services. We meet at a time when the challenge of poverty in this abundant society is, at last, beginning to be met. We are here at a time of tremendous possibilities for American education--and a time when we seek together long needed and greatly expanded possibilities for day care services to American children of poverty.

Now, in this year of 1965, we seek new roads to a Great Society. We seek not merely a vision but, I can assure you, a very real expectation by President Lyndon B. Johnson that we can succeed.

Because this is so, let us speak today of what seems to me a critical need in waging and winning the war against the inherited economic and cultural deprivations that wall off the individual from the rewards and repsonsibilities of a democratic society. This is the need for cooperation, for understanding, for common purpose among all the social institutions of America--and today, specifically, those of education and of welfare.

If I would seem to stray beyond the borders of my own competence, I assure you that I do so boldly--but by no means wrecklessly. In the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we have sound and solid working arrangements, and we recognize our mutual responsibilities and objectives.

There are those today who, for reasons that strike me as strange, prefer to emphasize the individual prerogatives, differences, and distinctions between health and welfare as an art or profession--and health and welfare as they relate to education.

This divisiveness serves no useful end. Today, common purpose, common cause, common deeds are absolutely vital if we really want to do something about institutionalized poverty, about the victims and captives of poverty--of more than 5 million children in families who live in abject deprivation in an abundant America.

And today, we pursue our common goals with unprecedented legislative acts designed to do something about poverty and not merely examine and discuss it.

Last month, the Congress passed and the President signed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Last year, the Congress passed and the President signed the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

This year, we can hope that the President's request for expanded day care centers also will be enacted into law.

So today, armed with an array of legislative tools passed by the Congress, we have the opportunity to make the battle against poverty not merely a campaign of words and hope but a war of deeds and action--whatever our specialties.

What should concern us, then, are our own acts--how we work together for the sake of children, whatever the circumstances of their birth. We are not concerned with the circumstances of birth but with the potentialities of life.

Thus, those of us in education are now becoming educated in the purposes and potentials of the preschool centers. Here we seek to give all children of deprivation a fighting chance--a head start--to succeed in school and then in life.

Many of these same children are the special concern of day care centers. The objective is to provide new possibilities, new options for the children of poverty whose parents must leave them alone at home. And they are of special concern to us here.

We are concerned with their needs--for a healthy, livable environment all day long; for adults about them who care about them; for parents who may work in dignity with the assurance that their children are not, as two such youngsters once described themselves, "Nobodies from nothing."

The day care centers themselves are in need. Far too often, these centers have been so poorly supported by our communities that many parents who cannot afford the fees--however critical the situation--must forego that service.

If the day care centers are to succeed, if they are to do their job adequately, clearly they must be supported adequately, so their services can be made available to those who need them most. And surely it is time to begin to find this support. Here there can be no division between us in one house marked "Education" and in another house marked "Welfare."

Now where do we stand within our houses in developing harmony and closer working relationships? What are the possibilities that education and welfare have in common? What are the common goals of the day care center and, for example, the new movement toward preschool centers for our urban and rural poor?

First of all, let us agree with the rather obvious conclusion that education, as well as day care, may take place anywhere--in any building--in the open air, if it comes to that.

This we may see as clearly in the day care centers of the settlement houses in some of our most deprived communities as in the glass-walled monuments to public education in the wealthy suburbs, or, even if we have the imagination, in the olive grove where Plato taught in Athens.

Second, let us agree that the resources of teaching can be vastly expanded and enriched through a whole new range of talent--able people from a variety of backgrounds who can work superbly in day care centers as well as in schools. Just as education can take place in almost any setting, so teaching can proceed from a larger base than professionally certificated teachers. This is not a theoretical notion. We can see it in action--in Oakland, California, for example, where children attending day care centers receive sound educational help from older students, from mothers who volunteer their time, and from caseworkers assigned to the center.

Another source of this so-called "subprofessional" talent--the term makes me shudder--is VISTA volunteers and returned Peace Corps men and women. These people have clearly and powerfully demonstrated their extraordinarily high motivation, courage, and sound common sense. They know how to teach, and they know how to lead and to inspire. In fighting poverty's war, they present themselves as elite front-line troops.

Third, and finally, I think we can agree that the fortress school of the past is on its way out--and that we ought to hurry its departure. The fortress school is the school that slams shut its gates at 3 o'clock or so each afternoon, that closes down each summer, that is in the community but not of it. Such institutions must be replaced, not with new bricks and cement but with a new focus and a new spirit.

The end of the fortress school can be seen within 30 blocks of this meeting place--at the Cardoza Model School. Here, hearts are open to children; minds are open to fresh thought. Here, outstanding teachers, working in an atmosphere that stimulates creativity and imagination, are proving that the schools need not restrict themselves to a purely academic role; they are an integral part of the communities they serve.

In Baltimore, just 30 miles from the Cardozo School, is an equally remarkable project. There, one of the most vital movements in American education is taking place.

In this project, children selected from the poorest homes--in neighborhoods where crime and delinquency rates have been so high that school teachers have found it unwise to make home visits alone or after dark--have been brought into preschool classes in four schools as part of the daily educational program.

Imaginative kindergarten teachers have been assisted by volunteer mothers and teacher aides who work in partnership with the parents of the children. And here are some of the preliminary findings:

- Every child who entered the Baltimore preschool project in February 1963 entered kindergarten in September 1963 and first grade in September 1964. Previously, older children from the same families often failed to enroll in kindergarten at all.

- In kindergarten, the children with preschool experience had no problem of school adjustment, according to their teachers. On the contrary, they adjusted as well to school as middle class or well-to-do children admitted to other Baltimore kindergartens.

- First estimates by their teachers indicate that two-thirds of the children from the preschool project show achievement in kindergarten at the top 50 percent of their class, and that one-sixth of these children are in the top quartile of their class. This level of accomplishment also appeared to hold true as they entered the first grade.

There are those, as we have observed, who see a division between education and social welfare. Such a division--if, in fact, there is one--cannot continue to exist. And it need not. This we have learned, for example, from the cooperative effort between the Office of Education and the Office of Economic Opportunity, and among the agencies of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The moving forces of American society today call for a close partnership among all of us to make universal opportunity and individual accomplishment available to all our people.

Our first priority, then, is to bring education and encouragement to the children of the city slums and depressed rural areas. These are the children who most need excellent schools, well-trained teachers, courses designed with imagination and purpose. Most of these children have never had such experiences.

We go forward supported by public understanding that poverty and poor education are always linked by general agreement--that the schools of the poor must be strengthened and vitalized if progress is to be made in the struggle against hopelessness and despair, and if our Nation is to achieve the goals that beckon us.

Those of us here tonight have joined forces in that effort. We see that our objectives and aspirations require concerted effort--that we must not be separated by artificial barriers, that there is much we can give each other, that it is time to get on with the job together, united once and for all.

TWENTY PERCENT OF THE NATION

JULIUS B. RICHMOND, M.D. Program Director, Project Head Start, Office of Economic Opportunity

A NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON DAY CARE reflects the times. For, after a period of relative quiescence following the Lanham Act nurseries of World War II, there has been a spurt of interest in the care of young children. This must be gratifying to the members of the National Committee for the Day Care of Children, the Child Welfare League of America, and the Children's Bureau--the organizations sponsoring this Conference--and many others who for years have advocated better services for the young child and his family.

But the partial deafness to the recommendations of these groups, which prevailed in the past among public policy makers, seems to have disappeared--it may even have been replaced by a hypersensitive hearing (what we might refer to medically as selective hyperacusis). This increase in interest is reflected in publications which are appearing. The recent publication of the World Health Organization on Care of Children in Day Centres in 1964,[2] the comprehensive evaluation by Mayer and Kahn entitled Day Care As A Social Instrument: A Policy Paper,[3] published in 1965, and a special issue in March 1965 of CHILD WELFARE,[4] the journal of the Child Welfare League of America, are but a few evidences of the increase in interest in the development of the young child. And the complete report of the Child Welfare League of America study on day care is yet to come. In the light of the comprehensiveness and incisiveness of these publications, it is difficult to say anything novel about this problem. Indeed, I can only play the role of reporter rather than prophet, for these publications provide rather comprehensive discussions of the future.

---

[2] World Health Organization: CARE OF CHILDREN IN DAY CENTRES: Public Health Papers 24. New York: Columbia University Press, 1964. 189 pp.

Currently, a consensus has swept the country--and considerably in advance of professional and institutional readiness for it. Nonprofessionals responsible for shaping public policy and citizens at large have finally improved their hearing and have been listening to those who are aware of the significance of early childhood as the formative years for personality development and learning. They have moved toward large-scale support of programs for young children while some professionals remain bogged down in the quagmire of debate on the institutional forms through which services may develop. That the public is ready for these services is evidenced from the support recently provided by Congress for day care services through the Children's Bureau, and for the more extensive support of improved care for young, disadvantaged children through the Office of Economic Opportunity, partly through Project Head Start. The enthusiastic response of communities throughout the United States for this program is tangible evidence of interest and understanding.

If further evidence is necessary to establish that we have a current consensus for the improvement of the environment of the young child living in poverty, let me quote the following:

> "Much of the research in recent years in the field of child development has singular relevance to the culturally disadvantaged youth of this Nation. Current studies show that irreparable damage of preschool retardation is especially acute among the economic and socially deprived....

---

[3] Mayer, Anna B. with Kahn, Alfred J.: DAY CARE AS A SOCIAL INSTRUMENT: A Policy Paper. New York: Columbia University School of Social Work, 1965. [177 pp.] (Processed.)

[4] CHILD WELFARE [Special Issue on Day Care], 1965, 44 (March). 178 pp.

> "Investment in preschool and early elementary education not only results in conserving and perfecting human resources but in the long run will even effect a monetary savings. It would have the immediate effect of cutting the costs of remedial instruction and the long-range impact of reducing juvenile delinquency, unemployment, and other costly social and economic problems.
>
> "Any bill designed to upgrade and modernize American education which does not focus on preschool training is antiquated before it is even enacted. The most imaginative innovations of recent years in teaching techniques and equipment have been made at the preschool level. Let's not attempt a step forward by starting 10 years behind."

This statement is taken not from a group of eager, starry-eyed professionals but from the minority report on HR 2362, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.[5] [6]

What are some of the factors responsible for the current consensus or zeitgeist (attitude)? It seems to be focused on three major issues:

1. That an affluent society must deal with the problem of poverty more effectively. Approximately 20 percent of the Nation, 35,000,000 people--17,000,000 of them children--living under adverse circumstances are on our conscience. In addition to the humanitarian basis for improving their lives, there is a growing awareness of the high cost of providing services for this group.

2. That if the problems of poverty are to be dealt with effectively, we need--to quote Mayer and Kahn[7] --". . .a social instrument to offer compensatory educational and child development experiences for the very young." This may provide the

---

[5] Minority Views. [In] ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965. House of Representatives Report No. 143 [to accompany H.R. 2362], March 8, 1965; 89th Congress, 1st Session. 80 pp. (p. 72.)

[6] ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965: An Act to Strengthen and Improve Educational Quality and Educational Opportunities in the Nation's Elementary and Secondary Schools. Public Law 89-10, 89th Congress, H.R. 2362, April 11, 1965. 32 pp.

[7] Op. cit., see footnote 3.

basis for their breaking out of "the cycle of apathy, dependency and anti-social solutions which poverty and discrimination breed."

3. That the services for young children and their families provide for their health, welfare, and education comprehensively through one program. Fragmentation of services is not likely to lead to adequate or effective utilization.

But for the professional community and citizens active in the field of child welfare, the consensus is not new. They have manifested an awareness of the need for constructive group experiences for the young child for many years. For example, the 1940 White House Conference on Children in a Democracy recommended that schools provide nursery school, kindergarten, or similar educational opportunities for children between the ages of 3 and 6. A decade later, the Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth recommended:

> "That as a desirable supplement to home life, nursery schools and kindergartens, provided they meet high professional standards, be included as a part of public educational opportunity for children." [8]

If we have had such advocacy for years, what has been the resistance to forward movement? There are many historical, social, and cultural reasons for our lag in acting on the recommendations which have been before us for decades. These are summarized very adequately in the publication of Mayer and Kahn. But perhaps their most cogent point is the following:

> ". . .As long as day care is considered to be geared mainly to solving existing or incipient emotional and psychological problems growing from child neglect and available through an individual diagnostic approach, its goals are restricted. Seen as a therapeutic social service, the program may expand somewhat, but will continue to be relatively small.
>
> "It can be argued that to see day care not as a diagnostically selective individualized service, but as a form of 'developmental provision' to enhance child rearing, would be more

---

[8] PLATFORM: RECOMMENDATIONS AND PLEDGE TO CHILDREN. Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth. Raleigh, N.C.: Health Publications Institute, Inc. [n.d.] 15 pp. (p. 5, No. 19.)

> economical per child and would do much more to strengthen family life."[9]

Another very significant factor retarding progress has been the large-scale professional resistance to group care for young children, except under very special circumstances as noted above. Although well motivated, it was based on the misinterpretation and overinterpretation by practitioners in the various child care professions of the data and findings reported on so-called maternal deprivation. This often led to doctrinaire positions which held that the child's developmental needs are served best only by his remaining exclusively with his parent or parents. Some programs of public assistance were heavily rooted in this orientation.

That well-informed, fortunately situated parents have not shared this anxiety concerning separation is evident from the popularity of early childhood education programs among middle class groups. The extensive utilization of campus nursery schools and the development of cooperative nursery schools where institutional programs do not exist are eloquent testimony that well conducted group experiences for young children are widely considered to be desirable supplements to family life.

If one questions the desirability of supplementation to family life for lower income groups, let me quote from a study of a group of 250 prematurely born infants from low income families reported in PEDIATRICS by Helen Wortis and her associates: [10]

> "Other elements [than the child-rearing patterns] in the environment were preparing the child to take over a lower class role. The inadequate incomes, crowded homes, lack of consistent [family] ties, the mother's depression and helplessness in her own situation, were as important as her child-rearing practices in influencing the child's development and preparing him for an adult role. It was for us a sobering experience to watch a large group of newborn infants, plastic human beings of unknown potential,

---

[9] Op. cit., see footnote 3 (p. 42).

[10] Wortis, H.; Bardach, J. L.; Cutler, R.; Rue, R.; and Freedman, A.: Child-Rearing Practice in a Low Socioeconomic Group: The Mothers of Premature Infants. PEDIATRICS, 1963, 32, 298-307 (August).

and to observe over a five-year period their social preparation to enter the class of the least-skilled, least-educated, and most-rejected in our society."

It seemed logical, in the face of our growing national concern with poverty, that Mr. Sargent Shriver, on assuming the position of Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, would concern himself with the impact of the early childhood environment as a contributing factor to the transmission of poverty from one generation to another. He thereupon appointed a planning committee of distinguished professionals from the various child care professions, under the chairmanship of Dr. Robert E. Cooke, Professor and Chairman of the Department of Pediatrics at the Johns Hopkins University, to study the issues and to make recommendations for the program of the Office of Economic Opportunity. The introduction to the report of the Committee reads as follows:

"1. There is considerable evidence that the early years of childhood are the most critical point in the poverty cycle. During these years the creation of learning patterns, emotional development and the formation of individual expectations and aspirations take place at a very rapid pace. For the child of poverty there are clearly observable deficiencies in the processes which lay the foundation for a pattern of failure--and thus a pattern of poverty--throughout the child's entire life.

"2. Within recent years there has been experimentation and research designed to improve opportunities for the child of poverty. While much of this work is not yet complete there is adequate evidence to support the view that special programs can be devised for these four and five year olds which will improve both the child's opportunities and achievements.

"3. It is clear that successful programs of this type must be comprehensive, involving activities generally associated with the fields of health, social services, and education. Similarly it is clear that the program must focus on the problems of child and parent and that these activities need to be carefully integrated with programs for the school years. . . .

"4. The need for and urgency of these programs is such that they should be initiated immediately. Many programs could begin in the summer of 1965. These

> would help provide a more complete picture of national needs for use in future planning." [11]

The development of Project Head Start resulted from these recommendations. Communities throughout the Nation have been busily working to develop their applications. We anticipate that within the next 10 days, grants will be announced to approximately 2,600 communities, which will conduct over 10,000 individual programs for approximately a half million children. We realize that the movement has been rapid and that the program is generating an unprecedented demand for health, educational, and child welfare services. But, note, I stated we are generating a Demand--not a Need--for the Need exists because we have failed to meet it. We cannot afford to fail to meet this need any longer.

What I have been proposing is that we extend Mayer and Kahn's suggestion of offering "developmental provisions for the child" by the establishment of child development centers by choice rather than out of necessity. It is our conviction that in modern society, a need for the justification of such programs no longer exists. Rather, what is needed now is attention to the kind of program which will fulfill the objectives of each community.

Note that I use the term child development center--rather than day care, for the young child. This is done, not for the sake of semantic quibbling, but rather because it places the emphasis on the child--and by inference, on his family--rather than on the institution through which he is served. As we have developed the concept of care for the young disadvantaged child in the Office of Economic Opportunity, we have found it to be descriptive of centers which bring services in the fields of health, education, and welfare together in one program. For the needs of the young child must be met comprehensively in order for him to thrive.

But in order for these centers to function on behalf of children and their families--no matter what the auspices--we will need to blend our professional and institutional talents and resources. This means submerging our professional and institutional proprietary and power interests and aspirations. It also means that we must keep open various alternatives concerning administrative patterns, professional standards, and institutional loyalties in the interest of children.

---

[11] IMPROVING THE OPPORTUNITIES AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE CHILDREN OF THE POOR: Report Prepared for the Office of Economic Opportunity by a Panel of Authorities on Child Development, February 1965. Washington, D.C. Office of Economic Opportunity, Head Start, 1965. [8 pp.]

In short, it means we must all assume a statesmanlike posture--evaluating all factors in favor of the common good. As professionals we have been, for a long time, advocates of better programs. Now that large-scale public support is becoming available, we may not like the rate at which we are being asked to support services. But as public policy is shaped, support does not necessarily develop in neat packages. But the need is great and the challenge is ours. Dr. Leon Eisenberg, in addressing himself to some of these issues 3 years ago, quoted Hillel, first among the sages of Israel, "If I am not for myself, who is for me? And if I am for myself (alone), what am I? And if not now, when?"[12]

---

[12] If Not Now, When? Speech delivered by Leon Eisenberg, M.D., Professor of Child Psychiatry, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine and Children's Psychiatric Service, at the 39th Annual Meeting of the American Orthopsychiatric Association, March 21-24, 1962. AMERICAN JOURNAL OF ORTHOPSYCHIATRY, 1962, 32, 781-793 (October).

A TIME FOR ACTION

SENATOR ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF

THIS IS A HOMECOMING FOR ME. To see so many old friends--to join you in a cause to which we are all devoted--to reminisce with you about battles we have fought and skirmishes which lie ahead in the fight for better care for all our children--these are exciting; these are challenging circumstances.

As a nation, we have moved forward in the field of welfare and better opportunity for our needy citizens in the many months that have passed since August 3, 1961. This was the day on which, as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, I first met with many of you representing day care programs, and told you of my plan to take a good, hard look at all of our nation's welfare commitments.

We met then at a critical time for our social welfare programs in these United States. We admitted it.

We spoke of the headlined action by an official of a city in New York State in regard to State and Federal welfare regulations which had put the spotlight on our welfare problems.

I told you I considered the situation in Newburgh only a symptom of public questioning, in a time of sweeping change, about our welfare laws, their efficiency, and their impact on the community. A symptom, though it hurts the sufferer, is sometimes health-giving in the end. It provides the signs that aid the diagnosis and, perhaps, the cure.

Perhaps we have not found the absolute cure. But we have made real progress. Much work was done by many, many people, in government and out of it--including many of you. Various individuals and committees I appointed--the Ad Hoc Committee on Public Welfare, for one--submitted the facts on the welfare situation in the United States. These facts were studied and carefully analyzed within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I submitted our recommendations to the Congress. And we now have the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962. As a nation, we have switched gears; our emphasis in seeking fresh solutions to welfare problems, and indeed to all the problems of our needy citizens, is placed on prevention, and where it is too late, on rehabilitation--a fresh start.

We now recognize that in the long run, the only way to cut welfare costs is to prevent dependency before it occurs and to rehabilitate those who are already on the welfare rolls. In so doing, we now recognize that public welfare must become more than a salvage operation, confined to picking up the debris of human lives--that it must become a constructive force in society.

Public welfare must seek to strengthen and preserve the family unit; it must contribute to the attack on such problems as dependency, juvenile delinquency, family breakdown, illegitimacy, ill health and disability. For unless such problems are dealt with effectively, they pyramid, affecting society as a whole and extending their consequences in troubled families from one generation to the next.

Concerned with the dignity of the human being, and resting on the belief in the individual human spirit, our amendments had a positive goal: to move people off relief (thus cutting costs in the long run) by renewing their spirit and creating economic and social opportunities for them.

I am very proud of the 1962 Welfare Amendments. In truth, they laid the basis for the present war on poverty. In these amendments, Congress did not condone dependence. Far from it. Independence was to be achieved through proven, properly managed programs of prevention and social rehabilitation. For the dependent person is beset by ill health, faulty education, racial discrimination, and inadequate skills. Responding to these complicated problems by just handing him a "relief check" may help, but it is seldom an adequate solution.

In these amendments, Congress provided a network of new services which constituted an advance guard action for the current all-out attack.

And, as broad and comprehensive as these amendments were, we admitted in framing them that the process of evolving comprehensive and up-to-date welfare laws is never finished. Therefore, we set up a study commission to review our public assistance and child welfare programs. Under the outstanding leadership of Dean Fidele Fauri of the Michigan University School of Social Work, this distinguished commission is now holding hearings throughout the country. Its recommendations will be in by July 1, 1966, and these will provide a base for any further legislation that is needed in this field at that time.

I am particularly proud of the authorization for funds to help in the growth of the day care program in the Public Welfare Amendments. These funds were to be used to stimulate licensing laws and to develop programs that would offer protection as well as to pay for day care for children whose mothers were working or who, for one reason or another, were receiving inadequate care during the day.

Surely this was one of the most important and forward looking steps taken by our country in the recognition of great needs. These needs of our children had been dramatically highlighted by our studies. For example:

- We had 22,000,000 working women. Almost 3,000,000 had children under 6 years of age; another 4,600,000 had school age children between 6 and 17.
- We had 50,000 children of migratory farm workers who were 2 to 4 years behind other children in our country in education.

- We had 17,000,000 children living in deteriorated housing (not taking into consideration overcrowded conditions) for whom care outside of the home during the day was important.

- We had the mentally retarded, the emotionally disturbed, and the crippled children whose parents often faced the agonizing choice between total institutionalization or total isolation within the home. In many cases, this meant that the handicapped child had no opportunity for normal growth, for normal association with others his own age.

- We had, too, the 5½ million children in broken families, many of whose lives were distorted by the absence of one or the other parent.

- And we had the large, increasing number of children whose mothers worked full or part time during the day.

- But, most of all, as we examined what was happening in the country, we realized we had a large number of programs and services for these children which fell far below the accepted standard. We knew that children were not being cared for at all during the day, or were cared for by older sisters and brothers who could not attend school themselves because they were forced to act as foster parents.

- We knew that many of the group programs were carried out in unsanitary and dangerous housing, and that many of the men and women who offered child care did so simply to make money.

This, then, was the need which prompted the day care provision of the child welfare program. The philosophy underlying it was simple: Human needs of children must be met. They must be met now! Children are children only once. Yet how could we ask women to go to school to learn new skills? How could we hope to break the cycle of dependency, when there were not enough decent places to keep their children? And how could we help the handicapped child, and his parents, if the dollar stood between the child and adequate day care?

The problem was too large to consider providing all of the care centrally by the Federal Government. Besides, it was apparent that day care had to become one of the network of community services if it was ever truly to meet the needs of the families and children throughout the country. What we did then was to stimulate activity and participation in all of the localities--urban, suburban, and rural--where care for children was lacking.

For licensing laws were chaotic, and no two States were in agreement on what constituted good care. There were some five States that had no licensing whatsoever, and a great many States where no true definition of day care existed. So it was, and still is, possible to operate very poor programs under other names.

Nevertheless, even a small amount of Federal money meant that States began to examine their licensing procedures and that advisory committees within States were set up to examine the structure and adequacy of programs.

What have been the actual consequences of the day care legislation?

- First of all, there has been great progress in day care in such a short time--progress seldom equalled in our history.
- There has been improvement in licensing.
- Standards for the operation of day care programs have been raised.
- Dangerous and unsafe situations, detrimental to the health and welfare of children, have been uncovered--and there is increasing public awareness of the need to do something to eradicate these situations.
- The provision of new models for day care programs has added breadth to the overall picture of what good day care services can and must be.
- In 2 years, there has been a 20 percent increase in the number of children being cared for in licensed day care facilities.
- All in all, 49 States are now supporting some form of day care, 33 providing family day care, and 31 buying day care in existing centers. Fourteen States are currently drawing up legislative measures that will strengthen licensing procedures. A number of States are working deligently to raise standards.

But there is still a long way to go--in day care and in all child welfare services.

So far as day care is concerned, you must remember that passage of an authorization act by Congress does not mean the funds are then available. It merely means that Congress has given itself the legal power to appropriate funds up to, but not exceeding, the amount set forth in the authorization act. By the time we were able to get any funds at all for day care in the 1963 budget, there were only 2 months remaining in the 1963 budget year, for which an appropriation of $800,000 was passed.

In 1964 and 1965, the Congress cut the President's budget requests of $8 million for day care to $4 million. In 1965, these funds were further restricted by a proviso requiring that by January 1, 1966, States will need to match Federal day care funds dollar for dollar. And these requirements would have been imposed sooner had I not intervened in behalf of the later date.

The problem here is that there is a growing disparity between Federal expenditures and State and local expenditures for child welfare services. State expenditures for these services are now at an all-time high.

These State expenditures are mounting to meet rising costs of providing services which are mandatory--such as protecting abused and neglected children and providing foster care where it is needed. But, in many cases, States simply cannot raise their child welfare expenditures to match day care services on a dollar for dollar basis. And State matching will be required under the present law by January 1, 1966.

This problem, as well as many others which affect our children, have very much been on my mind in recent days. For, as you know, the Finance Committee on which I sit is now considering H. R. 6675--the Social Security Amendments of 1965. Some people have the notion that this bill would provide Medicare for our older citizens--and that's all. This is quite wrong! The new social security measure is a vast bill, affecting not only the aged, but all of us and all of our children.

In fact, it is really a "Childcare" as well as a Medicare Bill--increasing survivor benefits for children as well as adults, liberalizing disability benefits for children as well as adults, and enlarging the maternal, child health, and crippled children's programs.

And so, into this bill--perhaps the most significant welfare measure to be introduced in the Congress since the 1930's--I have decided to offer a package of amendments, all geared to further the interests of our children, and so our nation's future.

First, so far as day care is concerned, I will ask the Congress to take out the specific, earmarked item for day care. Instead, I will suggest that the total Child Welfare Service authorization be increased--that it be set at $45 million for the next fiscal year and increase annually until it reaches $60 million in 1970, and that all the States be required to include day care by 1967.[13]

Such a change would, I believe, move us further along toward our common goal: more good day care services for more youngsters. After all, we no longer need earmarking of funds to stimulate the initiation and expansion of day care services; they are now recognized as an integral part of child welfare programs. What our States need are the funds actually to run day care programs. This they would be required to do under my plan.

The second part of my program grows out of the terrible tragedy of the Kennedy assassination, the tragedy which made us conscious of many things that are weak in our society.

One of the most devastating parts of the story of the assassination was reported authoritatively by the Warren Commission:[14] Lee Oswald, as a 13 year old, had come to the attention of the welfare and psychiatric authorities in New York City. But, for many reasons, he had slipped through society's fingers, left to disintegrate, and eventually to become the assassin of a great and beloved President.

And so I introduced a bill in the Senate under which we could mount an attack on the problems of emotionally disturbed children. Since it would provide welfare services for children, this measure seems logically to fit into the program I will propose next week. Incidentally, the response to this bill, S. 488, has been enormous. The mail I have received indicates a part of the suffering and tragedy caused by emotional illness. People have written about this subject with intense feeling--you could read between the lines that this sort of problem had in one way or another touched their lives, too.

---

[13] The 1965 amendments to the Social Security Act (Public Law 88-97), as finally passed by the Congress, do not contain the provision that all the States be required to include day care by 1967.

[14] REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON THE ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY. Washington, D.C. 20402: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964. 888 pp. (p. 10.)

We would approach this mental health problem through an expansion of the authorization now in H. R. 6675 for health services for school age and preschool age children. The extra annual $5 million would go to projects for identifying and providing care and treatment for emotionally disturbed children, to be administered by appropriate agencies. And the amendment would also set up a topnotch commission--which the professionals in this field desperately want and need--to do a definitive study of the country's resources for emotionally disturbed children. Once the facts are in from this distinguished source, we could take another look at the problem and what additional steps must be taken to solve them.

The third and fourth sections of the new package are based on a premise with which I am sure you will agree: A child--like his parents--should be rewarded, not punished, if he tries to help his family by earning a little extra money to achieve a diploma, and lick dependency.

Last year, I offered an amendment which became law. It permits AFDC children of 18 to 21 years of age--if the State in which they live agrees--to continue on public assistance if they are regularly attending high school, or completing a course of vocational or technical training designed to prepare them for gainful work. I propose to broaden that provision to include any type of school, including college.

Another amendment I expect to offer would require the welfare authorities to consider school expenses in determining payments for any dependent child (including books, transportation, lunches, activity fees, and so forth). What's more, my program would exempt some earnings of dependent AFDC children. I have always felt that it is folly to penalize a child who wants to deliver newspapers, or get a summer job. Initiative should be rewarded, not condemned. That is why I am suggesting that a child of a family on public assistance be allowed to keep up to $50 of income earned by him each month. This would serve as an incentive to children to work while attending school and during the summer months.

This brings us to the last part of my program. This would amend the present medical assistance part of our social security laws, the Kerr-Mills Act. The present bill already would greatly expand and make more equitable the provisions for medical assistance. But technical limitations in the definition restrict the groups of medically needy people for whom Federal matching might be claimed.

My amendment would remove these restrictions so that it would be possible for States to get Federal participation on behalf of any medically needy child or other person.

This would bring into the group of persons for whom States might, if they chose, claim matching funds, about 5 million youngsters now living in poverty--under the Medical Assistance provisions of the bill we are considering. Some of them are children who desperately need medical and dental attention, and whose parents can't pay for it. And they are children who are not eligible for this medical or dental attention--even under Federal laws--now, or under the improved provisions of H. R. 6675 as it passed the House, because they haven't been deprived of parental support by the death, absence, unemployment, or disability of a parent.

I will introduce this broad program in behalf of our nation's children as amendments to the pending social security bill. But I cannot do the job alone. I need the help of interested, concerned citizens like yourselves--in every community of this land.

The need is great; it cannot be met only by Federal appropriation. It will be important in every State for interested citizens to convince their local legislators that the neglect of children is costly, and that the provision of funds for day care results, for example, in a sound preventive program.

Leaders in social welfare tend to be too modest. You are really very important people. Your Senators and Congressmen and State legislators have respect for your experience, your judgment, and your dedication to public service. Make it a point to see them often, to share your problems and your goals with them, and to educate them in the details of your crucially important work.

I do hope that in your conference sessions you will give serious consideration to the community action that will be needed to insure the funds if we are ever to wage an all-out battle on child neglect. The new Project Head Start program offers us real hope. It will give a large number of children some of the opportunities to which middle class families are accustomed. But it will not solve the whole problem. There are still, and there will be, a very considerable number of children who cannot hope for equal opportunities in their own homes.

Federal legislation is only one of the answers and, so far, it has not been enough. Among the problems has been the lack of a strong community voice reaching the halls of Congress. Many of your legislators are still unaware, or unconvinced, for instance, that there is a community demand for day care.

Why--I am asked in the cloakrooms--should we make it possible to induce more women to leave their homes? Despite all studies you know so well--studies which prove that the presence of good day care does not induce women to go to work, nor its absence persuade them to stay at home--some of the most respected members of Congress repeatedly ask this question.

And, they ask, won't the program become so large and costly as to be economically nonfeasible? "And should," as one of my colleagues put it, "the Federal government go into the babysitting business?"

Those of us who are your proven friends in the halls of Congress ask you to speak up for our children. Make it your business to see that all the facts are known to your legislators. And follow up through community action at home. For, as I said to you many years ago, Americans--and their representatives--do care! They are compassionate, they are realistic--and pragmatic. To produce the answers, they need only to understand the facts.

Your job is to give them these facts. Your job is to convince them of our cause.

After all, what cause is more important to the Great Society, in which we all believe, than the cause of the child?

"The childhood shows the man, As morning shows the day,"[15] John Milton told us 3 centuries ago.

This is still true. If our mornings are to become bright tomorrows, then surely we must continue our persistent commitment to fuller opportunities for all of America's youngsters.

---

[15] PARADISE REGAINED, Book 4, Line 220.

ADDRESSES BEFORE SUBCONFERENCES

Subconference A

THE COMMUNITY MOBILIZES

keynote
address

THE NATION'S WORKING MOTHERS AND THE NEED FOR DAY CARE

MARY DUBLIN KEYSERLING Director, Women's Bureau,
U.S. Department of Labor

WE JOIN TOGETHER in this important conference in common recognition of the urgent need for the expansion of day care facilities--a basic service which should be available to every child who needs it. Recognizing that the child's early and most formative years are the key to the future of the individual and to his capacity to live a productive and rewarding life, we know that there is no more tragic waste in our country today than a neglected child. Society, no less than the individual, pays a terrible price for the lifetime blight which follows all too often from inadequate child care. And because we believe so strongly that a fair start in life is the birthright of every American, we are resolved to face up more realistically than ever before to the hard and inescapable fact that, as a nation, we are not fulfilling this essential promise of our democracy for all too many of our nation's children.

Our challenge in the work groups to follow this session is to consider the means by which we can speed the mobilization of our communities to more effectively meet a need which now has clearly reached most disturbing proportions.

We are concerned today with the provision of day care and preschool education in all their forms--in day care centers, nurseries, and kindergartens, through family day care and in after school programs--not only for the children of working mothers but for all children who can benefit. The deprived child in the poverty stricken home, even when the mother is present, may have no less a need for the developmental experience of adequate group care. The child in many advantaged households may have no less to gain from a preschool educational opportunity. Many of us can envisage the time when the recommendation of the 1940 White House Conference on Children in a Democracy, reiterated in 1950, and again in 1960 at the White House Conference on Children and Youth, will be realized: "That as a desirable supplement to home life, nursery schools and kindergartens be included as part of public educational opportunity for children." [16]

How far off such a time may be is not now predictable. The need arising out of the fact that millions of women work today because they must, in order to support or help to support their families and because facilities are not adequate to care for so many of their children, must be met and be met without delay. And our Nation has the capacity to meet the human and social needs of our times.

Women today comprise over a third of the Nation's wage earners. Their number in the work force has doubled during the course of the past quarter century. Of all our women aged 18 to 64, 45 percent are now in the labor force. Some 26 million women were in the labor force last year. The Nation's economy could not have functioned without them.

No change with respect to women's employment is more striking than the increase in labor force participation on the part of mothers of children under 18 years of age. Between 1940 and 1964, the number of such working mothers increased more than sixfold. In 1940, a million and a half mothers with children under 18, or about 9 percent of such women, were in the labor force. Today's 9½ million working mothers represent almost two-fifths of all working women and slightly more than one-third of all mothers in our population. A mother of children under 18 is now four times more likely to work than before the war.

---

[16] PLATFORM: RECOMMENDATIONS AND PLEDGE TO CHILDREN. Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth. Raleigh, N.C.: Health Publications Institute, Inc. [n.d.] 15 pp. (p. 5, No. 19.)

It is especially significant for us to note that since 1948, the participation in the labor force of mothers of preschool children has increased almost as rapidly as in the case of mothers of older children.

The mother's decision to look for employment outside her home is strongly influenced by the age of her children. Among mothers whose children are 6 to 17 years, nearly 5 out of 10 work. But even among mothers of children 3 to 5 years of age and with none younger, 3 out of 10 work. More striking still, 2 out of 10 mothers with children under 3 are now in the labor force.

More women are able to work today because there are more jobs available. Most of them seek work because of economic necessity. This is particularly true of the mother of young children, and most especially true of such mothers where there is no father in the home.

For example, in families where in 1964 the mother was widowed, separated, or divorced and had children under 18 years of age, 56 percent worked. That many among them were dependent on their own earnings for the support of their families is evident by the fact that even when they had children under 3 years of age, 37 percent of these women were in the labor force. When they had children 3 to 5 years of age, 54 percent were employed. It is estimated that there are some 600,000 preschool age children of working mothers in fatherless homes.

About one-fourth of all families in poverty today are headed by a woman. How essential is the provision of publicly financed or very low cost day care facilities for children in these families is indicated by the fact that one-half of all fatherless families live in poverty, defined as an income of less than $3,000 a year. There is no need for me to underscore how few of these mothers can afford to provide adequately for their children when they must be absent from home. Day care programs must be expanded to meet the needs of far larger numbers of their children than are presently provided for.

In husband-wife families, 23 percent of mothers with children under age 6 were working in 1964; financial need was clearly the motivation of most who did so. Where the husband's income was less than $5,000 a year, the mother of preschool children was more than twice as likely to work as the mother whose husband's income exceeded $10,000 a year.

In husband-wife families with children 6 to 17 years, 43 percent of the mothers were in the labor force. Again, financial need was a primary motivating factor. Where the husband earned less than $5,000 a year, half of these mothers worked, in contrast with only a quarter of those women whose husbands earned at least $10,000 a year.

The role inadequate income plays in the decision of mothers of preschool children to work is further revealed by the fact that half of such women have husbands who earn less than $5,000 a year. In the case of working mothers with children 6 to 17 years, in significant contrast, 36 percent have husbands earning less than $5,000 a year.

Among all American families in which the husbands' incomes are over $10,000 a year, there are only 186,000 working mothers of children under age 6. With relatively few exceptions, the mothers of preschool children whose income permits them to do so elect not to work outside the home.

Recent Labor Department studies, updated for subsequent price rises, suggest that a "modest but adequate" standard of living for a city family of four, and where the children are young, requires on the average about $6,500 a year. The income of a substantial majority of the families where mothers of young children work, and where husbands are present, falls considerably short of these "modest but adequate" standards.

Not only are women working in rapidly rising numbers, but they will play an even larger role in the labor force in the years ahead. A recent projection by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor suggests that almost half of the people expected to be added to the labor force from 1964 to 1970 will be women. This assumes a 17 percent increase in the number of working women compared with a 9 percent increase in the number of working men during this period. Just as in the past 25 years, employment is likely to rise most rapidly among women in their middle years whose family responsibilities have lightened. But the greatest significance for those of us who are concerned with the need for the expansion of day care services is this: Between 1960 and 1970, a 55 percent increase is expected in the number of working mothers aged 20 to 44 with children under age 6.

Today there are 15 million children whose mothers are in the labor force--about one-fourth of all children under 18. Five million of these children are between the ages of 6 and 11; 4 million are less than 6 years old, and an estimated half of these youngsters have mothers who are employed full time.

What arrangements are presently being made by working mothers to provide care for their children? To answer this question, the Children's Bureau and the Women's Bureau this year cosponsored a national sample survey undertaken for us by the Bureau of the Census. Preliminary findings have been made available especially for this conference.[17]

The survey was limited to the 6 million mothers who worked 27 weeks or more in 1964, either full time or part time, and who had at least one child under 14 years of age living at home. These mothers had a total of 12.3 million children under 14, one-fifth of all children in the United States in this age group.

Only 2 percent of these children were in group care. The family's income made no significant difference as to whether the child was cared for in group programs. Of the somewhat more than 2 million youngsters age 3 to 5, only 7 percent were in group care.

In 1958, the Children's Bureau sponsored a similar survey of child care arrangements made by working mothers. It was estimated that facilities for about 185,000 children were then available. Today licensed day care facilities are available for only about 255,000 of the millions of children in the country who need them. One conclusion is inescapable. The large-scale employment of women--now a fixed aspect of our culture--is increasing far more rapidly than the day care facilities available for their young children. The lack of day care services is now one of the most serious of our unmet needs on the domestic social scene. The gap between need and service widens daily.

---

[17] CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS OF THE NATION'S WORKING MOTHERS, 1965: A Preliminary Report. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Welfare Administration, Children's Bureau and U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau. Washington, D.C. 20201: Children's Bureau, 1965. 14 pp. (Processed.)

Our 1965 survey shows that of the more than 12 million children covered, 8 percent were expected to care for themselves. Of these latchkey children, a significant number were under 6 years of age.

In the case of 13 percent of the children in the survey, the mother reported she looked after the child herself while working. Low income mothers were twice as likely to do this as those in moderate or comfortable circumstances. More than a third of the children looked after by the mother while at work were under age 6.

Fifteen percent of the children in the survey were cared for in homes other than their own--half of them in homes of people not related to them. Nearly a third of the children under 6 years of age were cared for in homes other than their own.

Nearly half of the children in the survey were provided care in their own homes, usually by their father or another relative. For 5 percent of all children in the survey, the relative caring for them was a youngster under 16.

Care in the home or in other homes may be good. In some cases, it may be very bad. Scarcely a day goes by when this isn't proved to be so by the tragic stories reported in the local press. Earlier this week, our Washington papers reported on a Senate Committee hearing. Said one witness, a widowed mother of two children, "I am very tired about the way I have to live." She testified she had paid a babysitter to take care of her two children while she worked. She came home one day, she said, and found the children had been severely beaten. She reported she quit her job and is now trying to live on the $91.60 she receives monthly in survivor benefits under social security. A mother with two children trying to make ends meet on $1,100 a year--a mother and two children for whom day care should have been available!

Multiplied by thousands in each of our States, is this the best our great democracy can afford for our children? Add up the cost of the lifelong consequences when children fail to get a fair start. Recent University of Chicago studies hold that at least one-third of the learning that determines later levels of school achievement takes place by the age of 6. Between the ages of 3 and 6, much of the battle of the future is won or lost. For the child who falls behind in the beginning, failure builds on failure, culminating all too often in dropping out of school, in delinquency, in unemployment. Skill has become a necessity in today's world. The lack of it virtually guarantees the repetition of the cycle of poverty.

The cost of our failure to provide child care is immeasurable in human terms. Perhaps we should develop a new kind of social accounting to translate these losses into dollars and cents terms as well. How small in comparison would be the cost of provision of the day care programs we now lack.

The preliminary findings of our survey indicate an appalling degree of need among working mothers, but it tells only a part of the story. It doesn't reflect the need for the day care of children whose mothers may be at home ill or for other reasons unable to care for them--children no less in need of good day care for their physical well-being, for their growth and development. Day care should be provided for children who are economically or culturally deprived who can benefit from day care services: 15 million of our children are numbered in the families of the poor. But the need for expanded day care services is broader still. They should be made available to all children in a democracy who can benefit from them.

As the President's Commission on the Status of Women maintained in its report: "For the benefit of children, mothers, and society, child care services should be available for children of families at all economic levels."[18]

Conceiving of group programs for preschool children as desirable only for the deprived runs counter to our democratic traditions. Said the President's Commission:

> "Where group programs serve children from a cross section of a city, they provide training grounds for democratic social development. Their educational possibilities range from preparing underprivileged children for school, to providing constructive activities for normal youngsters,

---

[18] AMERICAN WOMEN: Report of the President's Commission on the Status of Women, 1963. Washington, D.C. 20402: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963. 86 pp. (p. 20.)

to offering especially gifted children additional means of development."

Progress is in the making. Fifty of our jurisdictions have set up day care advisory committees and have approved plans for day care; 41 jurisdictions have authority to license day care centers; 44 to license day care homes. Thirty-nine of our States have Governors' Commissions on the Status of Women. Virtually every Commission which has thus far issued a preliminary report has vigorously urged the extension and improvement of day care services. The support of these key groups will be of great help in the mobilization of our communities--the task to which we address ourselves this morning.

Just 3 months ago, Project Head Start was launched. More than 3,400 communities have indicated a desire to participate in this 8-week program to help prepare children whose development has been slowed by poverty to enter school on an equal footing with their more fortunate classmates.

Mrs. Lyndon Johnson said at the time the program got underway that a million deprived children would be entering school this fall. She said:

> "Some don't know even a hundred words because they have not heard a hundred words. Some don't know how to sit in a chair because they don't have as much as a chair. Some have never seen a book or held a flower. All of us--thousands of men and women in this country--can give patience, kindness and a few hours of our time to start their minds growing. They have a wonderful potential. There is no more important task in our communities than for such children to hear a voice say: 'Come take my hand! ' "[19]

All children should hear a voice saying, "Come take my hand! " We can and must find the means to assure that all American children have the kind of care and educational experience that will help them to realize their fullest potentials. All children must have a chance to blossom. We must mobilize to provide year-round day care programs on a continuing basis for all children who need them, and provide them on a scale we can afford, on a scale our democratic commitment demands. This is why we are here today. No more important task confronts us all.

---

[19] Seminar held at the White House, February 11, 1965, to launch Project Head Start.

luncheon
address

THE MEANING OF DAY CARE FOR BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY

W. O. HEINZE Treasurer, Child Welfare League of America;
President, International Latex Corporation

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IS INCREASING at an alarming rate. Thousands of men and women are devoting their time to boys' and girls' clubs and other endeavors to try to arrest this tide. Millions of dollars are being spent for job training and other efforts to give purpose to our young people, to prevent their delinquency or to cure or alleviate it after it occurs. But, despite this enormous effort, the growth of delinquency continues.

I was not asked to talk to you today about juvenile delinquency, and you might wonder what it has to do with my subject which is "The Meaning of Day Care for Business and Industry."

It has this to do with my subject: America cannot waste its children. Our children are America.

The delinquency of which I speak is symptomatic of the fact that we are wasting our children and, to this extent, America is being weakened--and business and industry are being weakened.

To complicate the problem further is the fact that, today, one mother in three is working. Industry needs many of these mothers. It would have great difficulty in getting along without them.

But if the only answer to the satisfactory care of children were to insist that all mothers of young children stay home, this would be far preferable to depriving children of the care, attention, and affection which they need during these important formative years.

Fortunately for industry, for the economy, and for the future strength of the Nation, there are other answers. One of the most important is day care. But day care facilities today are totally inadequate to meet the problem.

At the beginning of World War II, when millions of women were needed in industry to replace the men who were drafted, children were being left alone at home or in parked cars, or became "latch key" children. To correct this situation and to meet some of the need for daytime child care, day care centers were opened all over the country, with Federal financing under the Lanham Act of 1941. By July 1945, about 160,000 children were receiving care in nurseries and day care centers financed largely by Federal funds. At the end of the war, Federal support was withdrawn and, in most cases, no other sources of support replaced it. As a result, most of the day care centers opened under the Lanham Act were closed, and no new ones took their place. Yet with the return of peacetime conditions, women--most of them mothers--continued to enter the labor force in increasingly large numbers.

At this time, there are licensed day care facilities, both day care centers and family day care homes, for only about 290,000 children. This includes both private and public facilities. The problem facing us today can be most clearly seen when we compare this figure with the 12 million children under 14 who have mothers who worked at least half of last year, either full time or part time.

From the 1965 survey of working mothers,[20] the following picture emerged: 1 in 12 children under 14 cared for themselves while their mothers worked. In the 12 to 13 group, 1 in 5 were on their own while their mothers worked.

---

[20] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Welfare Administration, Children's Bureau and U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau: CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS OF THE NATION'S WORKING MOTHERS, 1965: A Preliminary Report. Washington, D.C. 20201: Children's Bureau, 1965. 14 pp. (Processed.)

Most supplementary child care was given by a father or other relatives, generally in the child's own home. Although the relatives were usually over 16 years, about 5 percent of children were cared for by relatives who were under 16.

Group care--in nursery schools, day care centers, or organized settings--was used for only 2 percent of the children.

Thus we see, then as now, that most day care in the United States is informal--made on a private basis by individuals with no organized help from the community. Four times as many children of working mothers are left alone as are cared for in all forms of group care facilities.

Our concern is not limited solely to the young children left alone without any care, but for the quality of the care young children are receiving.

The largest percentage of children require day care because their mothers are working. However, other equally serious needs of children can also be met with day care. For example, for the family when the mother is dead, hospitalized, or incapacitated and the father needs help in caring for the child during the daytime; for the child whose mother--because of ill health or other urgent reasons--needs relief from his care during the day; or for the child whose mother, crushed with family burdens, needs a temporary respite; or for the child who can profit from being with other children under the guidance of professionally trained people at a day care center.

For children living in economically and culturally deprived families, daytime care can help prepare the child for successful school achievement. Through day care, this child is given learning experiences in an attempt to compensate for the inadequacy of his home and neighborhood, so lacking in the essentials for normal growth and development.

For disadvantaged children, especially youngsters from 3 to 5, this kind of day care is a means of providing them with intellectual stimulation and enriching experiences with the goal of reversing the psychological and intellectual effects of social and economic deprivation.

Though average incomes have increased and the country as a whole has enjoyed prosperity, there is a group of over 33 million Americans who live in want or poverty. In this group, there are over 11 million children.

For these young underprivileged, efforts are being made to find programs of daytime care that will compensate for impoverished backgrounds, a way the community can intervene in order to break the cycle of despair, ignorance, disease, and dependency of the depressed areas.

The 1962 Public Welfare Amendments to the Social Security Act provided Federal child welfare services funds for day care "to assist the states to provide adequately for the care and protection of children whose parents are working, or otherwise absent from the home or unable for other reasons to provide parental supervision."

Many considerations led to this provision for day care funds: The increase in employed mothers of young children; rising rate of school dropouts and juvenile delinquency; evidence that the care children are now receiving through private arrangements made by parents are, in many instances, inadequate; knowledge that public and private day care facilities serve but a fraction of the children needing service.

The welfare amendments have provided $4 million in both 1964 and 1965 to the States for day care services. This represents a gain in expanding day care services. But the gain is still extremely small when compared with what should be done to meet children's needs.

In some communities, it is feared that making good day care services more easily available will act as an incentive for women to work. But it is obvious that the lack of day care programs has not kept women at home.

Most communities have accepted the need to provide day care for children, but only if their parents are unable to provide care that is essential to the child's welfare. Daytime care to provide learning experiences for preschool children from culturally deprived homes is a new idea that is being explored at present. Many in child welfare believe that this form of day care should become widely available.

Business and industry must support the expansion of day care programs--both for parents who are unable to provide for their children and for those who choose to use a community supported facility as well.

Good day care programs are expensive and cannot be supported solely by parents' fees. Social subsidy is needed. There must be a far greater investment of private and public funds--Federal, State and local--to meet the day care needs that are being created by social changes.

Business and industry have a vital stake in day care. Business must accept responsibility for recognizing the parental responsibilities of its employees by helping to create conditions that make it possible for its employees to fulfill their parental responsibilities.

Business and industry require the labor of women. In essence, the one-third of American mothers who work do so because business and industry need them.

There are various ways in which business and industry can carry out their responsibilities. They can make sure that the work shifts of women employees who are mothers are consistent with their responsibilities at home. Some industries attempt to provide an opportunity for the part-time employment of mothers. Others take into consideration, in their personnel policies, the provision for mothers to be absent from work because of family emergencies. This is done in such a way that the mother has no fear that she will lose her job.

Business must view day care as essential to its proper operation. Therefore, they will make skilled executive personnel available to participate in planning for day care. They will seek financial support for day care. They will concern themselves with the proper location of day care facilities. They will strive for proper licensing laws to make certain that day care facilities, whether commercial or social agency, are properly run to safeguard children. In other words, they will not leave the planning of day care to someone else but will consider it a primary responsibility of business and industry, no less important than planning for actual business operations.

No business or industrial plant would locate in a community that did not have a clean water supply. It would not locate in a community that did not have a decent transportation system. How many businesses, however, really concern themselves about community provisions for the proper care of children of their employees? Good day care is essential to the health of employees' children, to the mental health of the mothers while they are working, and to the reduction of absenteeism and frequent job turnover.

During World War II, the Nation recognized clearly that to secure the labor of large numbers of mothers, it had to provide day care for their children. Today, there are even more mothers in employment than there were during World War II. We are not in a crisis in terms of a war, but we have created a crisis in terms of lack of resources for children.

As I said before, the future strength and security not only of business and industry, but of the Nation itself, require that we meet this enormous problem head on and that we solve it in a manner that will assure that the children of working mothers, underprivileged and disadvantaged children, obtain the care, attention, and affection they must have to grow up to be strong dependable American citizens.

I cannot leave without adding my personal "thanks" to all of you and to all the others who are laboring so mightily and with such dedication in the cause of children.

Many problems confront us, and them, but I am sure your dedication and love will inspire more and more businessmen and other citizens to join in the fight to make our nation strong, through its children.

luncheon
address

THE MEANING OF DAY CARE FOR LABOR

LEO PERLIS Director, AFL-CIO Community Service Activities

WHEN I WAS INVITED to speak on day care, I looked at my credentials and found them wanting.

I never ran a day care center, nor was I in one as a child.

All I did, throughout my life, which can remotely be related to day care was that I (a) read about it, (b) helped to organize one in the 1930's, (c) visited a few at home and abroad, (d) heard some talk about it at two or three board meetings of the Child Welfare League, (e) was wisely unconsulted about it by the Children's Bureau, and (f) listened for hours--is there a better way of spending one's time?--to the very persuasive Ellie Guggenheimer.

And so, since my qualifications for being here are, obviously, not very impressive, I asked an associate to gather statistics and my wife to write the speech.

All my associate had to do was badger the sponsoring agencies of this conference for some facts and figures, and all I had to do was to con my wife into giving me her opinions which, I must admit, was not too difficult a job to do.

Now, since most speakers, discussion leaders and, especially, resource specialists--or else why call them resource specialists?--at this 3-day conference are, I am sure, full of facts and figures, why waste your time?

You didn't invite me, I am sure, to repeat the figures which you so generously made available to me in the first place.

It is my guess you invited me here to say that I am for day care, and that day care is important.

Well, I am for day care. And, of course, it is important.

I was for it--and thought it was important--in the middle 1930's when I helped to organize a day care center in the fourth ward in Paterson, New Jersey, under the auspices of Labor's Non-Partisan League.

It was a primitive affair, to be sure, but no more primitive than day care centers sometimes proposed in 1965: "The mothers on the block," according to a description of one such center, "might decide to rent a store front and hire a teacher. The children would then go to school and leave the mothers free to take part-time jobs."

Come to think of it, this is quite an advance over the baby-sitting proposal we made in the middle 1930's.

Now it can hardly come as a shock to you that I am prepared, at this National Conference on Day Care Services, to stand up and be counted for day care--and even night care--by very kindly, warm-hearted, understanding, patient, intelligent mothers in their own homes.

How wonderful it would be, I often think, if every child could be cared for by his own mother--by someone who loves being a mother and housewife, who is at one with herself as a woman, wife, and mother.

How wonderful it would be, I often say to myself, if there were peace instead of war, if there were integrity, honesty, and forthrightness instead of double-dealing, back-knifing, and in-fighting.

Still, I can dream, can't I? But dreaming and wishing simply wouldn't make it so.

Young mothers die and leave young children. Can day care help?

Young husbands die and leave young wives who must shift for themselves and their small children. Can day care help?

Young women, out of wedlock, give birth to children whom they want to keep and support. Can day care help?

Young wives with young children are deserted by, separated from, divorced by their husbands. Can day care help?

Young wives work to supplement their husbands' meager incomes, and young wives work to live a bit more comfortably, and some young mothers work because they are better mothers when they combine the jobs of employee, housewife, and mother.

And here may I say, parenthetically, that in all our travels through space, time, and spirit, we really don't wander too far away from our roots. I remember my mother telling me--more than once I should add--that almost any fool can become a father but it takes a man to be one. I didn't think of it at the time, but I suppose the same applies to the female of the species. When a father isn't a father and a mother isn't a mother, can day care help?

This is what we really mean when we talk about working women, poor women, widowed women, deserted women, unwed mothers, and so on. What we are really talking about is not somewhere over the rainbow, but about the real world around us--an economy which makes women work and neglect their children, an economy which emasculates unskilled fathers of minority groups by depriving them of breadwinning dignity and livelihood, a society where the fast buck appears more important than the whole child. Problems such as these have been with us throughout history but they seem, at least to me, to be sharper now, perhaps because I am alive now and not in history, and perhaps because there are many more of us and, therefore, there are many more problems. But I don't wish to divert myself into a discussion of permissiveness, looseness, automation, free time, alienation, and the price of ripe tomatoes in south Jersey--all of which, or part of which, may have some relevance to the subject at hand, day care.

Since even the best people, in the face of statistics available to back up almost any opinion, still cannot agree on what are the best methods of child care, the best we can do, I suppose, is to reach a fashionable state of consensus. Perhaps there is no such thing as a best method of child care since each child, like each flower, must be tended differently--but all with lots of "tender loving care"--if we are to prevent the growth and proliferation of human weeds in the garden of human society.

At this point, I am prepared to pose these questions:

1. Day care--yes, but what kind of day care, and how about night care, and for whom?
2. Who will pay the bill?
3. Where does industry come in, and what are the responsibilities, if any, of labor and management, individually or collectively?

I don't know the answers to these questions, but I propose to speculate:

First, day care--yes! But any kind of day care--no! It is interesting how so many seem to agree about standards and how so many appear to be lacking in courage--the courage of experimentation, the courage of pioneering, and even the courage of comment.

The Children's Bureau, writing of good day care, says:

"The day care center (1) offers group care for the young child, 3 to 5 years old. As one of a group, the child can play, work, and grow under the guidance of a trained teacher. A professional director runs the center, which is inspected and licensed.

"The day care center (2) also offers group activity for the older child. Here his after-school hours and vacation days are guided by an interested, understanding group leader. . . .

". . .there are these unique extras in the day care picture:

[Its goals]: to make certain that the child's total health, education, and welfare needs are being met.

Its potent tool: that it is guided by people who care--trained social workers; professional teachers; capable, licensed day care mothers; and dedicated volunteers."[21]

Good day care can certainly be a major, if not the major, break in the family cycle of economic dependency and social irresponsibility.

Now let us see what the goals of the Play Schools Association are. For example, Mrs. Herbert H. Lehman, president of the organization, recently said that "the life of today's urban child is more threatened than ever by the subtle and crippling forces that come from distressing and confused family situations and bad conditions in the community." Mrs. Lehman further explained that the Play School program signifies "fun with learning, many constructive and creative things to do and, at the same time, many important lessons in good living to learn."

Now permit me to repeat: fun with learning.

Here, again, good Play School programs, providing after-school recreation in winter and all-day recreation in summer, can be an important break in the vicious cycle of economic dependency and social irresponsibility.

Now let us take a good look at one of the most promising antipoverty programs, Project Head Start. It is, according to the Office of Economic Opportunity, "a local action program for helping children of limited opportunity who will enter kindergarten or first grade for the first time in the fall of 1965. . . . Head Start should offer opportunities for a child's growth and development, not simply custodial care alone. . .it should deal with the whole child. . .health, social services and educational activities. . . . Parents will also need help in helping their children. . .and volunteers will be a vital part of most local Head Start programs. . . . Head Start programs may be sponsored by both public, voluntary or any private nonprofit, nonpolitical organization."

This program, perhaps more than any, carries with it the promise for the most important break in the vicious family cycle of illiteracy, ignorance, crime, disease, and poverty--or, as I said before, economic dependence and social irresponsibility.

---

[21] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Welfare Administration, Children's Bureau: WHAT IS GOOD DAY CARE? Children's Bureau Folder 53. Washington, D.C. 20402: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964. 11 pp.

But, here again, permit me to repeat: health, social services, and educational activities.

While all three programs are designed to meet somewhat different needs and address themselves to somewhat different age groups, they are all, nevertheless, stressing the whole child and the whole family, the need for educational, health, and social services, the need for professional and volunteer partnership, and the emphasis on the poor and lower income groups in our society.

Project Head Start's stress on education, however, should not downgrade the educational purposes of good day care.

All this is all to the good, but we still fail to come to grips with new approaches. What about night care? Don't children from broken homes need night care as much as day care? And when and how and where do we reach the poor, the dispirited, the frustrated parents? Are we prepared to experiment with the Kibbutz idea, and will it work in America? And what do we do with the hundreds of thousands of children under 12 who have to shift for themselves while their mothers work because they have to work out of necessity, including, at times, the necessity to earn a few more dollars to pay for their children's college education?

Perhaps, in the long run, we can save ourselves headaches, heartaches, and money if mothers and others would take care of their children and the government would take care of their college education.

And this brings us to the second question: Who will pay the bill?

Since day care is designed largely for non-rich, non-well-to-do families, I assume that both the Government (Federal, State, and local) as well as our voluntary agencies (such as United Funds, Community Chests, churches, etc.) will pay the bill. It may be therapeutic, as some claim, for a parent or family to pay something, but since the parent or family is not rich or well-to-do, the payment should be minimal, and any attempt to charge fees, on a graduated scale, based on income would be tantamount to the indignities of the means test.

Tax funds, of course, would have to bear the lion's share of the financial burden since there simply isn't enough voluntary money around. Head Start, for example, will be financed by the Office of Economic Opportunity up to 90 percent of the cost, and there is no reason why we shouldn't go along with the Child Welfare League's proposal for adequate Federal matching of expenditures, for child welfare services (as distinct from many payments for foster care) should not be provided by law, similar to the provision for public assistance services in the 1962 Amendments to the Social Security Act.

Day care, after all, is a social instrument, as Anna E. Mayer so aptly put it when she wrote, in collaboration with Alfred J. Kahn, that when in 1941 industry burgeoned, men were drafted and women went to work in war production plants, children were left alone, locked in parked cars, or forced to join the increasing number of "latch key" children shifting for themselves.[22]

All of this led to the passage of the Community Facilities Act of 1941, mainly known as the Lanham Act, under which Federal funds were available to the States on a 50-50 matching basis for the establishment and expansion of day care centers and nursery schools in different areas.

And it was Agnes E. Meyer, through her influential WASHINGTON POST article during those wartime days (later developed into her equally influential book Journey Through Chaos[23]) who needled our collective conscience into doing something about it--and right away. Our own AFL-CIO union counseling program is a direct outgrowth of this need and this needling.

Widespread acceptance of this wartime program is indicated by the fact that, by July 1945, about 160,000 children were receiving care in nurseries and day care centers financed largely by Federal funds.

Once again, the Federal ice was broken when the people and Congress were persuaded that day care was, indeed, a sound social instrument.

Justice Benjamin Cardozo, perhaps, put it best when, in writing the majority opinion of the Court which declared Title II of the Social Security Act constitutional, he said, "needs that were narrow or parochial a century ago may be interwoven in our day with the well being of the nation."

---

[22] Op. cit., see footnote 3 (p. 42).

[23] Meyer, Agnes E.: JOURNEY THROUGH CHAOS. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1944. 388 pp.

And so, the "general welfare" clause of the Constitution is constantly extended with the constant extension of the needs of the people which the "general welfare" clause of the Constitution was designed to serve.

Any arbitrary lines--and they must be arbitrary since there is no scientific basis for any other lines--designed to divide public and private responsibilities in many areas of public welfare, including child care and day care, are bound to fail simply because they are unrealistic and unworkable. While we often profess to cherish a mixed welfare arrangement of public, voluntary, and private institutions, the sole question all too often turns out to be: Who can afford to pay the bill? And the only answer all too often turns out to be: The Government. And this, then, becomes the sole criterion.

But Americans have the uncommonly good sense to know that while it is our democratic government and our taxes, there must be "voluntaryism" every step of the way--in citizen participation, in community action, on advisory committees, as watchdogs, as needlers, and as voluntary nonprofit service agencies, small as they may be.

Now where does labor and management come into all this?

I am old-fashioned enough to think that being a wife, a homemaker, and a mother is a full-time job.

I am old-fashioned enough to believe in self-reliance when self-reliance works, and in social responsibility when self-reliance does not work or needs a boost.

Still, I am current enough to know that there aren't enough jobs for all men; that many men who do work full time still don't earn enough; that the moments of truth, death, sickness, and desertion hit all of us; that some women prefer and are better off (and so are their children), psychologically as well as economically, working at a career; and that all of us, therefore, labor and management included, have a responsibility to help. We can do it by establishing voluntary joint labor-management committees to explore the problem; to help initiate community action, in cooperation with communitywide planning bodies, for day care generally; to sponsor company-union facilities for day care for the children of working mothers who are employees of the company and members of the union; to recognize that the job is too big for voluntary effort alone and to press for Federal and State action and appropriations for day care facilities; to cooperate with professional groups in developing high standards and enforcing them; to press for governmental licensing and effective supervision; to encourage volunteer participation and to promote lay-professional cooperation; and to support such public and voluntary agencies as the Children's Bureau, the Child Welfare League of America, and the National Committee for the Day Care of Children.

Now, there's a big order, isn't it?

But it doesn't look so big when we realize that in New York City alone, over 300,000 children are living on public assistance in this, the most prosperous year in American history. The number of children growing up on New York's public relief rolls has risen from 128,556 to 276,129 in the last 10 years. Of 14,325 children carried on the relief rolls last year, nearly two-thirds were born out of wedlock.

Dr. Julius Richmond, Project Head Start Director, recently reported that "many of the more than 300,000 children in 1,000 communities which will participate in Project Head Start programs this summer have never seen a physician, a dentist, or an optometrist before."

And Dr. Oscar Ornati, of the New School of Social Research, came to the conclusion that the "more we know about the poor, the clearer it becomes that children are a large part of the story." He said that out of 17 million poor persons under 18, more than 8 million are 6 or younger.

Dr. Ornati suggested "children development centers" for preschool children beginning with 18-month-olds. These centers, he said, should be provided with the "best in medical and psychiatric care, wholesome food, toys, books, music, paints and all that goes into making the best nursery schools."

The center, he added, should be made available to children between the ages of 18 months and 8 years (living in families, or with mothers, earning less than $6,000 a year) from early morning to late evening. It is an imaginative idea, of course, but not entirely a new one. It has been tried, in some fashion or another, elsewhere.

I suppose this would require some public courage and some public money. Certainly, it is too big for labor, for management, and for voluntary social services alone.

But if we don't try this idea, or if we don't find something similar or better, assuming there is something similar or better, then we shall never end the vicious family cycle of economic dependency and social irresponsibility. We'll simply make a small dent here and a tiny dent there, and go our merry way until the next emergency or the next conference.

Subconference B

DAY CARE: ITS VALUES FOR THE FAMILY

keynote
address

THE AMERICAN FAMILY -- IMAGE AND REALITY

JAMES R. DUMPSON Commissioner of Welfare, City of New York

THE TOPIC "The American Family--Image and Reality" in many ways is a formidable one. When initially contemplated by me, I recognized that the topic provided an excellent opportunity for a major statement on the American family by an eminent social scientist and I pondered, uneasily, about the conference's naivete in asking me to discuss it, and my audacity in accepting the invitation. But as I read and reread the focus of this subconference, with its focus on the values of day care for the family, I felt a little less uneasy.

I gained some security as I attempted to develop my outline in the belief that the committee did not want so much a learned treatise on the American family, its image and reality, as those insights that most social workers practicing in the broad field of social welfare might bring to your attention as a basis for discussion in your work groups.

And so, within the limitations that are implicit in my belief about the committee's primary design, I shall attempt to do two things in this presentation. First, I shall try to highlight some major considerations of what might be considered the ideal type insofar as the American family is concerned. And then, I shall identify in fuller detail a number of the realities for too many American families that hopefully will have significance for the workshops of this subconference.

I believe the title "American Family--Image and Reality" itself underscores an important fact for all of us. The word "image" may be defined as a likeness of a person or thing. It is what we conjure up about a person or thing. Reality, on the other hand, is what exists in fact or in truth; it is that which is real. The point emphasized in applying these terms to a consideration of the American family seems clear: the image we conjure up when we refer to the American family and the reality of what, in truth and in fact, exists as the American family may be, and for millions actually are, worlds apart. The real and the ideal are different. Maybe we need to redefine the ideal we have harbored of the American family in terms of the needs of society today. Certainly, in many ways, we need to change much that constitutes the form and experiences that is real and exists for millions of American families, for much that exists is destructive of people and our values.

Some of what I am stating here is trenchantly said in the opening paragraphs of the American Social Health Association's little pamphlet, That Dear Octopus--The Family,[24] by Dr. David R. Mace. Dr. Mace writes, "The concept of the family was, to use Shakespeare's vivid phrase, 'sicklied o'er' with such a mush of unexamined and somewhat ersatz ecstasy that critical investigation of its functioning was sacrilege. The family circle consisted of Dear Papa, Dear Mama, and the Dear Children. Their characteristic pose was seated in a neatly composed group before the fire, their radiant, glowing faces reflecting the flickering flames of the blazing logs. There, in an ooze of mutual affection and admiration and blissful contentment, they doted upon one another. It was all Very Beautiful and Very Splendid. Of course, everybody knew it wasn't really like that. But you never said so. That wasn't playing the game." Well, today, we have an opportunity to look at the image and reality, to say what is not so about the theoretical ideal, and then to identify what one child welfare service can contribute in closing the gap between image and reality.

---

[24] Mace, David R.: THAT DEAR OCTOPUS--THE FAMILY. New York: American Social Health Association [n.d.]. 12 pp. (Reprinted from CHILD STUDY, Volume 27, Spring 1950.)

All of us recall one or more of the definitions of the family we learned in Sociology I. Indeed, much of the image most people carry of the family comes from those definitions or variations of it that find their way into everyday discussions and even into commercial advertisements. The advertising billboards proclaim in various ways the image of the family to which Dr. Mace refers. Traditionally, when most of us refer to the family, we think of a group of persons, man and wife, bound together by the rite of marriage and the natural children of the parents or those adopted by the parents. They live together under one roof and they make up a household. As a unit, they interact and intercommunicate and fulfill the roles, defined by society and their cultural background, of wife and husband, mother and father, son and daughter, brother and sister. The parents, through their interaction, merge cultural patterns and transmit a common culture to the children. Not only is their interaction within the family, but the family influences and is influenced by the social complexity of the society of which it is a member.

As will be pointed out later, a variety of modifications and adaptations within the family are induced by such phenomena as industrialization, urbanization, and mobility, among others, and each an interrelated characteristic of modern day American life. And it may well be that the failure of many of us to take cognizance of these modifications in and adaptations of the family to social and economic change holds the seeds of the conflict between image and reality for the family.

Much of the image of the American family wittily described by Dr. Mace and held by the uninformed or unthinking fails to take into account the changes effected in the family by these and similar social phenomena. The traditional, economic function of the family is fulfilled by wage earning on the part of one or both parents, but for a growing number through transfer payments rather than the self-dependence of the old American farm family. Patterns of authority and age and sex roles have responded to the increased mobility of our families and to the demands of the labor market and of family economics for women as workers outside the home. But blurring the picture of image and reality is the fact that, notwithstanding substantial changes in the functions of the family, reproduction, provision of food, shelter and clothing, socialization and guidance of the children remain as central in the American family.[25]

In viewing our image of the American family based on theoretical constructs and our idealistic recollections, we like to think that three other functions are still carried out by the family, and I shall comment particularly on them because they have marked relevance to our concern at this conference today. I refer to the personality-maintenance function, the status-conferring function, and the socializing function.

It is in the family that the child has those early emotional experiences that determine the growth and development of personality. His first relationship experiences are in the family and they determine the character, quality, and strength of his capacity for relationship throughout his life. The family provides an emotional haven and while societal demands cut him free from the emotionally significant situations of very early childhood, he continues to have need for these gratifications, and it is the family that provides them. It is in the parent-child relationship and in the sibling relationships of the family that the child learns either constructively and in health to love, to hate, and the meaning of all those human emotions that form the very fabric of human relationships, or he is crippled in personality structure through the parent-child and sibling relationships. The family, then, through its personality-maintenance function, must be seen as the dominant social situation in which the child becomes a particular kind of individual.

Donald McKinley points out in Social Class and Family Life, "The family locates people within society . . . it provides a stability and predictability to our own lives and to society as a whole."[26] Individuals, through the family, derive their place insofar as class is concerned, as well as in the ethnic group, the region, community, and similar other social categories. In a society such as ours, with its class stratification and class mobility potentials, this status-conferring function of the family is an important determinant in the life of each individual because it calls for successful adjustment to a variety of social and psychological pressures growing out of the position or status conferred on one by one's family.

---

[25] Lindsey, Inabel D.: Influence of Socio-Cultural Factors on the American Family Today. [In] REPORT OF THE COOPERATIVE PROJECT ON PUBLIC WELFARE STAFF TRAINING. Vol. 2: Service to Families and Children in Public Welfare. Washington, D.C. 20201: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Welfare Administration, Bureau of Family Services, 1963. 298 pp. (p. 27-36.) (Out of print.)

[26] McKinley, Donald Gilbert: SOCIAL CLASS AND FAMILY LIFE. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1964. 306 pp. (p. 18.)

The final function of the family to which I have alluded earlier, and the one about which everyone is aware, is that of socialization. We know that it is the family that determines the standards of behavior and the values which will be incorporated as part of the individual. It is the family that transmits role expectations as father or husband, wife or mother. It is the family that socializes the child and the adult and makes possible through the processes the integration of the biological and social experiences that result in the individual personality.

The family, then, is the paramount kinship organization of all societies, truly the matrix of all societies and cultures. This is the theoretical base of the American family. It provides the image of the family to which for too long we have held an unquestioning, sentimental, loyalty that blurs and obscures the realities for millions of our American families. It is an image of family life that is permeated with marital bliss and filial love, that is economically secure and emotionally healthy. It is a two-parent family oozing with mutual affection and contentment and performing well all of the functions traditionally ascribed to it. It is an image that supports an assumption that we need only strengthen family life without questioning what there is to strengthen. We know this is sheer fantasy. Too often, we indiscriminately apply these terms and sentiments to the American family today--for whatever else it is, it is not a stereotype, something without distinguishing marks of individuality--and, more importantly for our purposes, an institution many of whose separate members have serious disabilities, aspects of social disorganization and distintegration.

Poor quality education, overcrowded delapidated housing, poverty, poor physical and mental health, alienation from the larger community, humiliation and rejection based on ethnic considerations are the experiences of millions of American families. The absence of the requisite values to support healthy family life on the part of parents and the impact of the social environment even when parents have the requisite value result in the weakness and disintegration of millions of American families. It is our cognizance of this other side of the coin that brings us to the realities of the American family to which I would direct your attention now. What, we must ask, are the characteristics of disorganization and disintegration that have relevance to the concern of this conference?

First, I would identify that disorganization that comes as a result of the dissolution or fracture of the structure of social roles in the family when its members are unable or fail to perform adequately their role obligations. This brings us specifically to the one-parent family in which more than 5 million children are reared. The increasing incidence of children born out of wedlock and of desertions, abandonments, and divorce support the increase in the number of children reared in one-parent families.

This uncompleted family unit renders the child fatherless, usually from birth. It is a family unit in which the potential "father-husband" fails in his role obligations, and both parents exhibit role failure with regard to social control and socialization. Of concern to this conference is the increase in the number of these incomplete family units and the distance there is between them and what needs to be in values for the members. The number of out-of-wedlock births in the United States in 1940 was 89,500. By 1950, the number had increased to 141,600, and in 1962, it reached 245,100. Obviously then, the rate of increase of out-of-wedlock births to total live births has continued to soar over the past 2 decades.

Significant for a nation involved in a war on poverty are the statistics which indicate that illegitimacy tends to occur more frequently in lower class families, and especially among those who themselves were born out of wedlock. Great emphasis in some sections of the Nation has been placed on the 18 to 32 percent illegitimacy rate among the racial minority groups. Not enough emphasis has been placed on a parallel fact--that for those of the minority groups whose integration into the national cultural patterns has been permitted and, indeed enhanced, the percentage rates for illegitimacy are closer to the national figure. Surely, there are indications here for next steps in our efforts to reduce out-of-wedlock births among minority groups.

Another factor contributing to one-parent families is the willful departure of one spouse through separation, desertion, or divorce. Desertion was the chief contributing cause of dependency of children receiving AFDC as reported in the American Public Welfare study, An American Dependency Challenge.[27] Indeed, close to 6 million children in the United States are living with only one parent due to separation, abandonment, death, divorce, and unmarried motherhood. The United States has the highest divorce rate among western nations. In 1959, it was 259 per 1,000 marriages in contrast to England's 74.5 and France's 175.4 (all in 1956). Our divorce rate over the years has continued to grow from 75.3 per 1,000 in 1900 to 231.7 in 1950 and 259 in 1959. Equally alarming is the steady increase of divorces involving children: For the year 1953, 45.5 percent; for 1955, 48.1; for 1957, 50.9; for 1959, 59.1; and for 1960, 57.0.

As we review these statistics, let us keep in mind that prior to the separation, divorce, or abandonment, we rarely have more than an "empty shell" family in which individuals live together but have minimal communication and contact with one another, and fail to offer the emotional support and its healthy personality-maintenance function, to which I referred in discussing the ideal family. The family that breaks up through divorce, separation, or abandonment has usually been a long time in breaking up, and the children have, for a long time, been the victims. The evidence suggests that it is the conflict that precedes the divorce or separation that may have the greatest impact on the growth and development of children.

Freudenthal[28] in discussing the one-parent family identifies certain basic dynamic factors that are useful in understanding life in these families as being present in one-parent families with sufficient frequency to reflect a specific and characteristic pattern. These elements, of important relevance to our assessment of the emotional health of families and their ability to fulfill their function, were (1) a sense of incompleteness and frustration; (2) a sense of failure; (3) a sense of guilt; and (4) marked overt or underlying feelings of ambivalence between only-parent and child. The expression of these dynamic elements in the attitudes, behavior, and total functioning of a large number of American families brings us to another reality that cannot help but disturb any complacency or sense of well-being that we might have had regarding this group of American families.

---

[27] Burgess, Margaret Elaine and Price, Daniel O.: AN AMERICAN DEPENDENCY CHALLENGE: A Study Made by the Institute for Research in Social Science of the University of North Carolina. Chicago: American Public Welfare Association, 1963. 285 pp.

[28] Freudenthal, Kurt: Problems of the One-Parent Family. JOURNAL OF SOCIAL WORK, 1959, 4, 45-48 (January).

Another important phenomenon associated with and, indeed, a requirement of industrialization in the United States which has tremendous impact as a reality for the American family is mobility. We are a moving population. Each year, some 20 odd million Americans move within the same county; another 6 million move to a different county; and 5 million or more move to a different State. During the 1960 White House Conference on Children and Youth, it was reported that in the 12 months ending March 1958, 12 million children and their families moved from one place to another.

We know that mobility of our population is a requirement of our economy. We know, too, that this mobility of people has its positive features--the strengths indicated in families by their search for a better life, responding to prospects for better employment, for better housing and better education. For many families, now is added the quest for freedom from intimidation and oppression, for freedom of soul and security of body, for human dignity and self-respect. This reaching out for opportunities for self-improvement represents a real strength in the family makeup and may be the compensating factor for the trials and tribulations that movement brings to individuals and groups. But surely this mobility has an impact on family life stability. It destroys important human ties and relationships. Families and their children lose the anchoring influence of friends, of relatives, and the casual but meaningful secondary relationships of the old environment.

Of particular importance for this discussion is the question: Who are the families who move? Mobility rates in the 12-month period previously referred to were higher across the Nation for our nonwhite population. About one-fourth of the nonwhite population moved, compared with one-fifth of the white population.

The tremendous internal migration within the United States during and since World War II has consisted of a steady flow of Negroes from southern agricultural areas to the industrial centers of the North and West. Migration of Puerto Rican families in smaller numbers has paralleled the movement of

2

Negroes in Continental United States and whites from the deep South and more depressed sections like Appalachia who are on the move to Chicago and other mid-West communities. Whether the movement is motivated by the family's voluntary search for a better life or whether it is enforced by public improvement and neighborhood redevelopment, the uprooting without preparation for it, and what follows, is bound to militate against the realization of emotional maturity and adequacy for satisfying, productive living for children and their families. Not only are left behind the acceptance, the sense of belonging, and the emotional security that these bring in spite of their real limitations, but in the new setting the family experiences isolation, rejection, and the absence of the availability of those social supports required for adequate family functioning. He is a "newcomer"--an "in-migrant." He is usually different culturally and ethnically. The family finds large areas of unmet need and gaps in the very services and social utilities that are required, not only to facilitate adjustment but to buttress and strengthen family living. This is a reality for the millions of American families that move and requires a level of community planning and an adequacy of social utilities--provisions that we have not yet achieved.

The economic plight of a large sector of American families has been dramatized for us by the data publicized in connection with the current war against poverty. Surely, all of us are familiar with the facts that have come out of our rediscovery of povery in our midst. Nine million families, involving over 11 million children, have been identified as having incomes under $3,000 a year, and 5.4 million families, involving a million children, have incomes of less than $2,000 a year. In spite of the real improvement shown in the income position of low income families during the last war, there has been no real improvement since. This is a reality we must face or else we miss one of the real messages of having rediscovered the poor. Indeed, since the war, deterioration has actually been found in the relative income position of the 20 percent with the lowest income. Surely, it is not necessary for this audience for me to detail the facts concerning poverty-stricken families in our country.

In terms of healthy family living, it is important to state again and again that these 14 million families are poor because they are poor in housing that is shabby, dilapidated, and costly beyond its worth; that these families are poor in the skills that are required to take advantage of opportunities for education and training and new employment opportunities. They are poor in health status and have the highest incidence of nutritional deficiencies, social diseases, alcoholism, drug addiction, and mental illness. They are poor because they do not have the social assets required for functioning, participating, and contributing as members of the community and so lack the satisfactions socially and emotionally that derive from compliance with the dominant cultural and value system demands of our society. They are poor because as Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, or Indians, they are heirs of a caste system that intensifies their feelings of alienation and denies them the learning experiences that would promote assimilation. Powerlessness and apathy are their common mentality. This is the reality of family life in America for close to 15 million families.

Of deep concern is the fact that well over a million of these families and close to 3-1/2 million of their children are already the acknowledged responsibility of government through the AFDC program. Yet the first ingredient, an adequate income maintenance level, is denied them because of the absence of a national standard of public assistance and the wide discrepancies in standards among the States. The average monthly payment per family, including vendor payments for medical care in December 1964, ranged from $39.47 in Mississippi to $212.22 in Illinois. The average monthly grant per recipient, including vendor payments for medical care ranged from $9.91 in Mississippi to $51.57 in Minnesota.[29] Can it be that, notwithstanding our pronouncements about the value we place on a secure, healthy, family life, we place a higher premium on the needs of the aged or blind than we do on a dependent child and the mother caring for that child? Or has the comfortable image of the American family blinded us to the realities of deprivation for these dependent families? Maybe, as we consider the realities of families who are dependent, we should examine whether our substandard levels do not contribute to further deterioration of family strengths and may even be a contributing factor in actual family breakup.

These are the same families whose need for adequate income maintenance and supportive and rehabilitative services we pretend to help in public welfare with the humiliation and degradation associated with the old Poor Law mentality. The ritual of securing the inadequate assistance available is a humiliating experience that results in loss of self-respect, which makes it impossible for the parents to have any status with their children, or for the children not to be adversely affected. Our contempt for the poor--whether the poor is an individual or a family, as expressed in our perpetuation of the Poor Law mentality, with the rituals of investigation and reinvestigation which stigmatizes our poor and denies the fact that we have never provided exits for them from dependency and poverty--is one of our national social crimes. But it continues to be the reality for the millions of families who must look, and have a right to look, to public welfare for care and protection. It is in shameful conflict with the image we like to project of the American family.

---

[29] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Welfare Administration: WELFARE IN REVIEW, 1965, 3, p. 28 (March). (Table 7.)

Probably there is no characteristic of our industrialized and urbanized society that has greater impact on the realities of large sectors of the American family than the demand of the labor market for women and the economic need within families for women to work. That witty description by Dr. Mace of the make-believe family which I quoted pictured Dear Mama having, as her sole responsibility, round-the-clock protection and care of the children in the home. Yet, in 1960, there were nearly 22.5 million women workers. They constituted nearly a third of all workers and over a third of all women 14 years of age and over. Here, in the District of Columbia, we find the most extreme situation of women at work: 44 percent of all workers were women and 52 percent of all workers over 14 years of age were women. Nationally, more than 6 out of 10 women who work are married. But of even greater significance to this conference is the number of women who are working and who have children under the age of 18 years. Of all women employed in 1959, 29 percent had children under the age of 18.[30] When we review the female labor force, we note that the percentage of married women with husbands present in the labor force increased from 48 percent in 1950 to 57 percent in 1959. In terms of image and realities of the American family, the prospects are even more significant. By 1975, 38.2 percent of the 84 million females 14 years of age and over are expected to participate in the labor force. By 1975, 46.5 percent of those in the age group 20 to 24 and 38.0 percent of those 25 to 38 will be in the labor force.

---

[30] U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Statistics: Special Labor Force Report No. 7. MONTHLY LABOR REVIEW, 1960 (August).

Viewed against the role expectation of the mother in the family and the growing complexity of living for all families and their children, the increasing incidence of mothers in the work force poses serious problems if the family is to fulfill adequately its function in our society. It poses the question: Who cares for these children while "Dear Mama" is at work? It also poses the question: How much does Dear Mama have to give to children after an 8-hour day in clerical sales (39.8), as operatives in the factory (16.3), as service workers (14.2), or as professional and technical workers (13.8)? And what of the AFDC mother who is working? In 1961, some 773,000 AFDC mothers were working chiefly as service workers (26.4), private household service workers (27.5) and unskilled workers (16.9). Here are families already burdened with dependency and its accompanying financial problems. The nature of their employment suggests the cultural deprivation of their life experience and suggests, therefore, that they understandably make up a large sector of those who are likely to reject or to be in conflict with our dominant social and cultural values. Is it impertinent to ask whether these mothers can possibly achieve the ideal role of mother in the family and rear children who have had transmitted to them the values and culture of our society, including our concept of a family and its parent-role expectations?

Let me just make reference to the realities of the social and economic environment of family life for the largest minority group in our country. The social and economic environment for the Negro family, which constitutes the largest single sector of the American poverty group, exemplifies that of the Puerto Rican, Mexican-American, Indian, and large group of Southern white families in our country. In spite of the importance to healthy family living, the median average income of the Negro family is $3,233 as compared with $5,835 for whites--a gap of 45 percent, a gap wider by 2 percent than it was 10 years ago. While the Negro constitutes 22 percent of the unemployed, where they are employed, 75 percent of them are found in the lowest and most unrewarding occupations of the labor force, and one in every four Negro women with preschool children is at work. In spite of the essential importance of adequate housing to healthy family life, one out of every six homes in this country has been classified as substandard. In spite of the priority we assign to education as a preparation for fulfilling family responsibilities, Negro children still receive 3-1/2 years less education than do white youngsters--education that is inferior and, thus, rendering the difference considerably greater.

The incomplete family, the broken family, are reported in high percentages for the Negro in our national social statistics. In the last year for which they are available, 1962, 23 percent of all nonwhite families were headed by a woman. In the same year, 20 percent of all married nonwhite women were reported as having their husbands absent; the result?--34 percent of all nonwhite children not living with both parents (1960). But this reality for the Negro family alone must be viewed against unemployment rates, for it is possible not only to see a relationship but also to predict a social result from an economic circumstance. In tables comparing the percent of nonwhite married women separated from their husbands with the unemployment rate of nonwhite males aged 14 and over, a correlation, in statistical terms, is seen between the two series of +.68 when the unemployment rate is moved ahead of the separation by 1 year. In other words, the separation rate in Negro families goes up about a year after the unemployment rate goes up.

The emotionally crippling effects of exclusion and alienation, that are part and parcel of the ghetto, perpetuate their pathologies and destroy those strengths and potentials that exist in every family. Even a cursory examination of the realities for the masses of Negro, Puerto Rican, Mexican-American, and Indian families and the environment in which they are nourished tells us how we must change that social and economic environment to nudge the family structure toward a form which supports the growth of people who can compete in the American mainstream.

In the minds of too many, the image of the American family is that of a stereotype. It is Dr. Mace's family circle of Dear Papa, Dear Mama, and the Dear Children in a social and economic environment that is Very Beautiful and Very Splendid, with the family exuding love and affection, economically secure, emotionally stable, and spiritually supportive. Without question, this is the ideal and it is approached by many, many families. But for many, many other families and groups of individuals who are living together, struggling to achieve the status that we call family, the reality is alarmingly different. For the latter, our prattle about "strengthening family life" while we persist in social and economic policies and practices that are inimical to healthy family growth and development is dishonest and shameful.

Our present society cannot sustain the traditional family of yesteryear. We must look behind the facade of the image of the family of today, identify and understand the stark tragedy, the unfulfillment, and the human waste that lie there. And then, we must set about with diligence, sacrifice, and commitment to provide and support those economic and social policies, practices, and efforts that will reorganize and strengthen family life for all.

luncheon
address

COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT OF PRESCHOOL CHILDREN IN CULTURALLY DEPRIVED FAMILIES*

ROBERT D. HESS Committee on Human Development,
Department of Education, University of Chicago

BY A SERIES of historical coincidences that brought about the war on poverty, those of you who work with preschool children have been asked to play a critical role that may profoundly affect the future of urban life, the economic and social course of the Nation, and the status and role of Negroes in American history.

The central role of preschool education in dealing with poverty is recognized at every level of government; preschool programs are being expanded at a rate that reminds one of the pressure of wartime emergency. If these programs succeed, the Nation will have brought off one of the greatest social and educational achievements of its history; if they fail or if their effects are scarcely discernible, we shall all be in worse condition than before, and the professions that work with young

---

[*] This research has been supported in part by a research grant from the Children's Bureau, Welfare Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Ford Foundation for the Advancement of Learning, and grants-in-aid from the Social Science Research Committee of the Division of the Social Sciences, University of Chicago.

children will have missed an opportunity that may not come again in our lifetime.

In a context of urgent need for preschool education, the central question is this: Can we successfully intervene on a massive scale in the cycle of generation to generation transmission of poverty and semi-illiteracy? Any answer that will be given to that question at the present time is based more on optimism than on experience and results. I do not need to tell this audience that it is naive, misleading, and irresponsible to make promises of easy success and instant results from large-scale programs intended to raise the educational level of working class children and families. There is some reason to be hopeful; at the present time, there is little basis for unrestrained enthusiasm.

The research now underway at the Urban Child Center of the University of Chicago is an attempt to reach a greater understanding of these central research and theoretical issues: How does cultural disadvantage affect the mind of the young child? When we strip away the strands of personal concern and sympathy for human tragedy, and after we discard the political slogans, what is cultural deprivation, and how does it act to shape and depress the resources of the human mind?

The arguments I wish to present today are these: First, that the behavior which leads to social, educational, and economic poverty is socialized in early childhood--that is, it is learned; and, second, that the central quality involved in the effects of cultural deprivation is a lack of cognitive meaning in the mother-child communication system.

I will argue in this paper that the structure of the social system and the structure of the family shape communication and language, and that language shapes thought and cognitive styles of problem solving. In the deprived family context, this means that the nature of the control system which relates parent to child restricts the number and kind of alternatives for action and thought that are opened to the child; such constriction precludes a tendency for the child to reflect, to consider, and to choose among alternatives for speech and action, and develops modes for dealing with stimuli and with problems which are impulsive rather than reflective, which deal with the immediate rather than with the future, and which are disconnected rather than sequential.

This position draws from the work of Basil Bernstein of the University of London. In his view, language structures and conditions what the child learns and how he learns, setting limits within which future learning may take place.[31] He identifies two forms of communication codes or styles of verbal behavior: restricted and elaborate.[32] Restricted codes are stereotyped, limited and condensed, lacking in specificity and the exactness needed for precise conceptualization and differentiation. Sentences are short, simple, often unfinished; there is little use of subordinate clauses for elaborating the content of the sentence; it is a language of implicit meaning, easily understood and commonly shared. It is the language form often used in impersonal situations when the intent is to promote solidarity or reduce tension. Restricted codes are nonspecific cliches, statements, or observations about events, made in general terms that will be readily understood. The basic quality of this mode is to limit the range and detail of concept and information involved.

Elaborate codes, however, are those in which communication is individualized and the message is specific to a particular situation, topic, and person. It is more particular, more differentiated, and more precise. It permits expression of a wider and more complex range of thought, tending toward discrimination among cognitive and affective content.

The effects of such early experience are not only upon the communication modes and cognitive structure, but they also establish potential patterns of relationship with the external world. It is one of the dynamic features of Bernstein's work that he views language as social behavior. As such, language is used by participants of a social network to elaborate and express social and other interpersonal relationships and is used, in turn, to shape and determine these relationships. The integral association between language and social structure is critical for an understanding of the effects of poverty upon children.

---

[31] For a full statement of his position, see Bernstein, Basil: Social Class and Linguistic Development: A Theory of Social Learning. [In] Halsey, A. H.; Floud, Jean; and Anderson, C. Arnold [Editors]: EDUCATION, ECONOMY, AND SOCIETY: A Reader in the Sociology of Education. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1961. 625 pp.

[32] Bernstein has used different terms of these two communication modes. In his chapter in Halsey, et. al., he calls them "public" (restrictive) and "formal" (elaborative). The terms used in this summary come from more recent papers.

Within the individual family, it emerges in terms of the principles which govern the decision-making activities which, themselves, help to regulate the nature and amount of social exchange.

The interlacing of social interaction and language is illustrated by the distinction Bernstein makes between two types of families--those oriented toward control by status appeal or ascribed role norms, and those oriented toward persons.[33] In status-oriented families, behavior tends to be regulated in terms of role expectations. There is little opportunity for the unique characteristics of the child to influence the decision-making process or the interaction between parent and child. In these families, the internal or personal status of the children is not influential as a basis for decision. Norms of behavior are stressed with such imperatives as, "You must do this because I say so," or "Girls don't act like that," or other statements which rely on the status of the participants or on a behavior norm for justification.

In the person-oriented family, the unique characteristics of the child modify status demands and are taken into account in interaction. The decisions of this type of family are individualized and less frequently related to status or role ascriptions. Behavior is justified in terms of feelings, preference, personal and unique reactions, and subjective states. This philosophy not only permits, but demands, an elaborated linguistic code and a wide range of linguistic and behavioral alternatives in interpersonal interaction. Status-oriented families may be regulated by less individuated commands, messages, and responses. Indeed, by its nature, the status-oriented family will rely more heavily on a restricted code. The verbal exchange is inherent in the structure--regulates it and is regulated by it.

These distinctions may be clarified by two examples of mother-child communication using these two types of codes. Assume that the emotional climate of two homes is approximately the same--the significant difference between them is in style of communication employed. A child is playing noisily in the kitchen with an assortment of pots and pans when the telephone rings. In one home, the mother says, "Be quiet," or "Shut up," or any one of several short, peremptory commands, and she answers the phone while the child sits still on the floor. In the other home, the mother says, "Would you keep quiet while I answer the phone." The question our study poses is this: What inner response is elicited in the child; what is the effect upon his developing cognitive network of concepts and meaning in each of these two situations? In one instance, the child is asked for a simple mental response. He is asked to attend to an uncomplicated message, and to make a conditioned response (to comply); he is not called upon to reflect or to make mental discriminations. In the other example, the child is required to follow two or three ideas. He is asked to relate his behavior to a time dimension; he must think of this behavior in relation to its effect upon another person. He must perform a more complicated task to follow the communication of his mother in that his relationship to her is mediated, in part, through concepts and shared ideas; his mind is stimulated or exercised (in an elementary fashion) by a more elaborate and complex verbal communication initiated by the mother. As objects of these two divergent communications styles, repeated in various ways, in similar situations and circumstances during the pre-school years, these two imaginary children would be expected to develop significantly different verbal facility and cognitive equipment by the time they enter the public school system.

---

[33] Bernstein, Basil: FAMILY ROLE SYSTEMS, COMMUNICATIONS AND SOCIALIZATION. Unpublished paper prepared for the Cross-National Conference on Research on Children and Adolescents, University of Chicago, February 20-28, 1964.

The orientation of our project is to view the child as an organism which receives a great deal of information of many kinds, much more than he can accommodate. What the child responds to, how he interprets stimuli, and how he reacts to it, are learned in interaction with the environment. He is taught what to attend to, how to interpret messages, and how to respond. These patterns of cognitive activity are socialized in early experience in the home, and become the basis upon which further cognitive development proceeds.

An analysis of language and social structure is necessarily concerned with the consequences of linguistic codes and their accompanying patterns of social interaction upon the developing cognitive faculties of the child. It is our argument that person-oriented families tend to justify behavior and emphasize its consequences; status-oriented families ask for rote learning and acceptance of the status quo--that is, they use a more rigid learning and teaching model in which compliance, rather than rationale, is stressed.

For our project, a research group of 160 Negro mothers and their 4-year-old children was selected from four different social status levels: Group A came from college-educated professional, executive, and managerial occupational levels; Group B came from skilled blue collar occupational levels, with not more than high school education; Group C from unskilled or semiskilled occupational levels, with predominantly elementary school education; Group D came from unskilled or semiskilled occupational levels, with fathers absent and family supported by public assistance.

These mothers were interviewed twice in their homes and brought to the university for testing for an interaction session between mother and child in which the mother was taught three simple tasks by the staff member and then asked to teach these tasks to the child.

One of these tasks was to sort or group a number of plastic toys by color and by function; the second task was to sort eight blocks by two characteristics simultaneously; the third task required mother and child to work together to copy five designs on a toy called an "Etch-a-sketch."

The objective of the project is to relate the behavior and performance of individual mothers to the cognitive and scholastic behavior of their own children. We expect to follow the children of the study through the first 4 years of school to obtain data on a more complete range of behavior. At our present, relatively early stage of analysis, data are being examined in terms of social class differences among the four social status groups of the study--professional (upper middle), skilled workers (upper lower), unskilled (lower lower), and public assistance (AFDC). At this point in the project, our data about the cognitive behavior and language skills of the children are limited.

I want to describe the interaction between the mother and child in one of the structured teaching situations. The wide range of individual differences in linguistic and interactional styles of these mothers may be illustrated by excerpts from recordings. The task of the mother is to teach the child how to group or sort a small number of toys. I should add parenthetically that the principle of grouping or classifying is basic to many learning situations and mental operations, and this task is not simply a game.

The first mother outlines the task for the child, gives sufficient help and explanation to permit the child to proceed on her own. She says:

"All right, Susan, this board is the place where we put the little toys. First of all, you're supposed to learn how to place them according to color. Can you do that? The things that are all the same color, you put in one section; in the second section, you put another group of colors; in the third section, you put the last group of colors. Can you do that? Or would you like to see me do it first?"

Child: "I want to do it."

This mother has given explicit information about the task and what is expected of the child. She has offered support and help of various kinds, and she has made it clear that she impelled the child to perform. A second mother's style is not quite so easily grasped by the child. She says in introducing the same task:

"Now, I'll take them all off the board; now you put them all back on the board. What are these?"

Child: "A truck."

"All right, just put them right here. Put the other one right here. All right, put the other one there."

This mother relies more on physical signs and nonverbal communication in her commands; she does not define the task for the child; the child is not provided with ideas or information that she can grasp in attempting to solve the problem; neither is she told what to expect or what the task is, even in general terms.

A third mother is even less explicit. She introduces the task as follows:

"I've got some chairs and cars; do you want to play the game?

Child does not respond. She continues:

"O.K. What's this?"

Mother: "Hm?"

Child: "A wagon?"

Mother: "This is not a wagon; what's this?"

The conversation continues with this sort of exchange for several pages. Here again, the child is not provided with the essential information he needs to solve or to understand the problem. There is clearly some impelling on the part of the mother for the child to perform, but the child has not been told what he is to do. There were marked social class differences in the ability of the children to learn from their mothers in the teaching sessions.

Each teaching session was concluded with an assessment by a staff member of the extent to which the child had learned the concepts taught by the mother. His achievement was scored in two ways: first, the ability to correctly place or sort the objects and, second, the ability to verbalize the principle on which the sorting or grouping was made.

Children from middle class homes were well above children from working class homes in performance on these sorting tasks, particularly in offering verbal explanations as to the basis for making the sort. Over 60 percent of middle class children placed the objects correctly on all tasks; the performance of working class children ranged as low as 33 percent correct. Approximately 40 percent of these middle class children who were successful were able to verbalize the sorting principle; working class children were less able to explain the sorting principle, ranging downward from the middle class level to one task on which no child was able to verbalize correctly the basis of his sorting behavior. These differences clearly paralleled the relative abilities and teaching skills of the mothers from differing social status groups.

There are, incidentally, differences between boys and girls in their ability to perform the sorts and to explain their sorting behavior. We have recently begun to explore these sex differences and, at this point, have only preliminary data. These data indicate a superiority on the part of girls and that the difference between males and females varies by social status with males doing relatively better in low status groups, especially in the father-absent category.

Table 1

DIFFERENCE AMONG STATUS GROUPS IN CHILDREN'S PERFORMANCE IN TEACHING SITUATIONS

A. Kind Sort (cars, spoons, chairs)

	Toys			
Social Class	Placed Correctly	Verbalized Correctly		N
Upper Middle	61.7	26.4	*42.9	34
Upper Lower	67.6	20.6	30.4	34
Lower Lower	60.9	21.7	28.6	23
AFDC	54.2	16.7	30.8	24

B. Color Sort (red, green, yellow)

Social Class	Placed Correctly	Verbalized Correctly		N
Upper Middle	70.6	26.4	*37.5	34
Upper Lower	70.6	20.6	29.2	34
Lower Lower	65.2	17.4	26.7	23
AFDC	45.8	8.3	18.2	24

A. Short O

	Blocks					
Social Class	Placed Correctly	One Dimension Verbalized		Both Verbalized		N
Upper Middle	73.5	58.8	*58.8	23.5	*32.0	34
Upper Lower	50.0	44.1	50.0	2.9	5.9	34
Lower Lower	52.2	17.4	20.0	8.7	16.7	23
AFDC	37.5	29.2	31.8	4.2	11.1	24

B. Tall X

Social Class	Placed Correctly	One Dimension Verbalized		Both Verbalized		N
Upper Middle	61.8	61.7	*63.6	26.4	*42.9	34
Upper Lower	47.1	41.2	45.2	14.7	31.2	34
Lower Lower	34.8	13.0	14.3	4.3	12.5	23
AFDC	33.3	20.8	21.7	0.	0.	24

---

*Percent of those who placed object correctly.

The difference among the four status levels was apparent, not only on these sorting and verbal skills but also in the mother's ability to regulate her own behavior and her child's in performing tasks which require planning or care rather than verbal or conceptual skill. These differences were revealed by the mother-child performance on the "Etch-a-sketch" task. An Etch-a-sketch toy is a small, flat box with a screen on which lines can be drawn by a device within the box. The marker is controlled by two knobs--one for horizontal movement, one for vertical. The mother is assigned one knob, the child the other. The mother is shown several designs which are to be reproduced. Together they attempt to copy the models. The products are scored by measuring deviations from the original designs. The mother decides when their product is a satisfactory copy of the original designs.

These sessions were recorded, and the nonverbal interaction was described by an observer. Some of the most relevant results were these: middle class mothers and children performed better on the task (14.6 points) than mothers and children from the other groups (9.2; 8.3; 9.5--Table 2A). Mothers of the three lower status groups were relatively persistent, rejecting more complete figures than the middle class mothers; mothers from the middle class praised the child's efforts more than did other mothers but gave just as much criticism; the child's cooperation as rated by the observer was as good or better in low status groups as in middle class pairs; there was little difference between the groups in effect expressed to the child by the mother. (Brophy, see next page*.)

In these data, as in other which I have not time to present, the mothers differed relatively little in the effective elements of their interaction with the children. The gross differences appeared in verbal and cognitive environments which they presented. The significance of the maternal environment lies not only in the lack of verbal exchange but in the structure of the interaction between learner and teacher. The working class mothers appear to be socializing passive learning styles on the part of the child, teaching him to be docile in such learning situations, in contrast to the more active, initiatory behavior of the child from a middle class home.

Table 2A*

PERFORMANCE AND INTERACTION ON ETCH-A-SKETCH TASK
(Means)

	Social Class			
	Upper Middle (N = 40)	Upper Lower (N = 42)	Lower Lower (N = 40)	AFDC (N = 41)
Total score (Range 0-40)	14.6	9.2	8.3	9.5
Average number of attempts	12.7	17.2	12.2	15.1
Complete figures rejected	2.3	3.6	3.5	3.4
Total score for child's contribution	5.9	4.0	3.4	4.0

Table 2B**

	(N = 34)	(N = 35)	(N = 23)	(N = 23)
Praises child	4.7	7.2	7.2	7.3
Criticizes child	6.5	5.7	6.5	6.0
Overall acceptance of child	2.2	3.2	3.5	3.7
Child's cooperation	5.5	5.3	4.0	5.0
Level of affection	4.5	5.6	5.4	6.0

---

*Mr. Jere Brophy was responsible for the analysis of the Etch-a-sketch data and for ratings of mother-child interaction.

**Ratings made by observer; low number indicates more of the quality rated.

The women in the study also varied in their perception of the school. In applying Bernstein's concept of status-oriented and person-oriented families to our data, we analyzed maternal responses to the question: "Imagine your child is old enough to go to public school for the first time. How would you prepare him? What would you tell him?"

One mother, who was person-oriented and used elaborated verbal codes, replied as follows:

"First of all, I would remind her that she was going to school to learn, that her teacher would take my place, and that she would be expected to follow instructions. Also that her time was to be spent mostly in the classroom with other children, and that any questions or any problems that she might have she could consult with her teacher for assistance."

"Anything else?"

"No, anything else would probably be confusing for her at her particular age."

In terms of promoting educability, what did this mother do in her response? First, she was informative; she presented the school situation as comparable to one already familiar to the child; second, she offered reassurance and support to help the child deal with anxiety; third, she described the school situation as one which involves a personal relationship between the child and the teacher; and fourth, she presented the classroom situation as one in which the child was to learn.

A second mother responded as follows to this question:

"Well, John, it's time to go to school now. You must know how to behave. The first day at school, you should be a good boy and should do just what the teacher tells you to do."

In contrast to the first mother, what did this mother do? First, she defined the role of the child as passive and compliant; second, the central issues she presented were those dealing with authority and the institution, rather than with learning; third, the relationship and roles she portrayed were sketched in terms of status and role expectations rather than in personal terms; and fourth, her message was general, restricted, and vague, lacking in formation about how to deal with the problems of school except by passive compliance.

These responses illustrate the tendency for status-oriented families and relationships to restrict the linguistic codes used in communication. The child who comes to school with a status orientation is prepared to engage in rote learning and passive acceptance of school authority in the learning situation. His initiative and participation in the learning possibilities of the school are meager. Not that all such children accept the authority of the school in this unquestioning fashion. They have few alternatives, however, except to resist and rebel. The range of choice open to them is limited by the nature of the cognitive and interactional environment in which they have had experience.

A more detailed analysis of the mothers' responses to this question grouped their statements as *imperative* or *instructive*. An imperative statement was defined as an unqualified injunction or command, such as, "Mind the teacher and do what she tells you to do," or "The first thing you have to do is be on time," or "Be nice and do not fight." An instructive statement offers information or commands which carry a rationale or justification for the rule to be observed. Examples: "If you are tardy or if you stay away from school, your marks will go down," or "I would tell him about the importance of minding the teacher. The teacher needs his full cooperation. She will have so many children that she won't be able to pamper any youngster."[34]

Table 3*

INFORMATION MOTHERS WOULD GIVE TO CHILD ON HIS FIRST DAY AT SCHOOL

Social Class	Category					
	Imperative	Instructive	Support	Preparation	Other	N
	(percent of total statements)					
Upper Middle	13.9	9.8	30.4	9.9	36.1	34
Upper Lower	48.0	4.7	13.2	2.5	31.5	36
Lower Lower	48.6	.8	14.8	.2	35.6	30
AFDC	48.3	2.4	19.0	1.8	29.6	27
	(percent of mothers using category)					
Upper Middle	47	41	76	38	85	
Upper Lower	83	17	39	17	75	
Lower Lower	80	6.7	43.3	3.3	76.7	
AFDC	85.2	11.1	51.8	11.1	74.1	

*The data in this and other tables in this paper are based on analysis of part of the total research group. The number in the status groups varies from one type of analysis to another. Complete data, including tests of significance between groups, will be reported in the final version of the paper.

Miss Roberta Meyer is responsible for the analysis of these data.

Against this background, I would like to return for a moment to the problem of the meaning or, perhaps more correctly, the lack of meaning in cultural deprivation. One of the features of the behavior of the working class mothers and children is a tendency to act without taking sufficient time for reflection and planning. In a sense, one might call this impulsive behavior, not by acting out unconscious or forbidden impulses, but in a type of activity in which a particular act seems not to be related to the act that preceded it or to its consequences. In this sense, it lacks meaning; it is not sufficiently related to the context in which it occurs, to the motivations of the participants, or to the goals of the task. This behavior may be verbal or motor--it shows itself in several ways. On the Etch-a-sketch task, for example, the mother may silently watch a child make an error and then punish him. Another mother will anticipate the error, will warn the child that he is about to reach a decision point; she will prepare him by verbal and nonverbal cues to be careful, to look ahead, and avoid the mistake. He is encouraged to reflect, to anticipate the consequences of his action, and in this way to avoid error. Recall the example of the mothers and the telephone calls. The one child was prompted to relate his actions to those of another person, to relate his acts to a time dimension, to delay, to observe, to consider the consequences. The other child was given a command that called for no such reflectiveness or required him to relate his behavior to the context in which it occurred. This is a model of a conditioned response rather than a problem solving strategy. A problem solving approach requires reflection and the ability to weigh decisions, to choose among alternatives. The effect of restricted speech and of status orientation is to foreclose the need for reflective weighing of alternatives and consequences. The use of an elaborated code, with its orientation to persons and to consequences (including future), tends to produce cognitive styles more easily adapted to problem solving and reflection.

---

[34] These two categories of response may be another expression of the difference Kohn (1963) reports between middle and lower class mothers' attitudes toward child rearing.

The objective of our study is to discover how teaching styles of the mothers induce and shape learning styles and information processing strategies in the children. The picture that is beginning to emerge is that the meaning of deprivation is a deprivation of meaning--a cognitive environment in which behavior is controlled by status rules rather than by attention to the individual characteristics of a specific situation, and one in which behavior is not mediated by verbal cues or by teaching that relates events to one another and the present to the future. This environment produces a child who relates to authority rather than to rationale, who although often compliant, is not reflective in his behavior, and for whom the consequences of an act are largely considered in terms of immediate punishment or reward rather than future effects and long-range goals.

If this picture is substantially correct, there are a number of implications for preschool programs. For example, it would argue that enrichment for the sake of enrichment may miss the point--that it is not addition or even more varied stimulation that is needed, but experiences which give stimuli a pattern of sequential meaning; it argues that such programs must not merely teach the child new words, they must show the child how ideas and events are related to one another; it argues that the transition that a child must make from a cognitive style of immediate reactivity to one of problem solving must be made by experiences with authority, not with machines.

When the data are more complete, a more detailed analysis of the findings will enable us to examine the effect of maternal cognitive environments in terms of individual mother-child transactions, rather than in the gross categories of social class. This analysis will not only help us to understand how social class environment is mediated through the interaction between mother and child but will give more precise information about the effects of individual maternal environments on the cognitive growth of the young child.

Subconference C

WHERE IS THE CHILD?

keynote address

A SPECTRUM OF SERVICES FOR CHILDREN

KATHERINE B. OETTINGER Chief, Children's Bureau, Welfare Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

TERRIBLE THINGS ARE HAPPENING to our children today.

And the terrible things growing out of human need and neglect are happening throughout our whole socioeconomic system. Yes, even in the "best" families. For the neglected and dependent child can be poor or rich--or in between.

Sometimes we fail to realize that all children are dependent--dependent on their parents and on society to provide them with just the bare necessities of childhood: the right to nurture and the right to grow up and mature in their own families, developing their own potential.

But society and, too often, child welfare itself continue to draw lines and to build barriers at providing a spectrum of services to a spectrum of children living in a spectrum of circumstances.

We fail to realize that however divergent these circumstances may be from the idealized, idolized, and advertised average American family, they, not the stereotype, represent the real "American way of life."

And this is precisely our problem today in day care.

Children and their families are being discriminated against--by culture, by age, by poverty, even by prosperity, and through a multitude of disrupting factors that are, unfortunately, also a part of our Great Society.

There is the dilemma of the working mother who, according to public opinion, must be in the labor market and the supermarket at the same time.

There are family breakups, changing family structures, unwed mothers, physical handicaps, mental retardation, emotional problems and mental illness, job mobility, cultural deprivation--a spectrum of problems in a quiet social revolution that has had a disquieting, if not an atomizing, effect on millions in all circumstances of life, from Appalachia to Westport.

And these problems, of course, hit hardest in our lowest income groups where illegitimacy, family strife, delinquency, have the highest visibility. It is granted that day care is a necessity for this group--even though sufficient funds may not always be granted by our legislatures. Even then, I fear, it is thought of as a patch-up rather than a preventive measure--a way of coping, or half-coping, with an already disintegrating family.

True, day care is for the poor, but too often in the public mind and even in the professional one, it is regarded as a welfare program for the low or no income groups alone.

Families in upper income brackets, it is believed, can find their own child care solution. But, too often, this becomes a matter of babysitting or dependence on irregular maids. These families in the middle and upper income groups also need the positive opportunities of good day care for their children.

And negligence in caring for young children and infants exists not only in poor families where haphazard arrangements may be made for them during a mother's working hours. On a higher intellectual level perhaps, but nonetheless careless, are the informal "baby parking" arrangements made, for example, by young college mothers who "bounce" their babies and young children around from one mother to another while they attend full-time classes or work to support their husband's college training. Surely while this may provide a lot of mothers for a child--several in one day very likely--it is not what I would call good mothering.

No haphazard arrangements, regardless of who makes them, are a substitute for day care, which is more than babysitting, more than custodial or holding action. It is a means of positive support for children and families in any income group who must, for a variety of reasons, seek outside help for full day care.

Day care provides the educational, social, and emotional enrichment that such children need and may not be able to find in even the "best of families." Mental illness, emotional instability, physical handicaps, retardation, family breakup, and working mothers are not phenomena of the poor.

As in lower income families, there are mothers in higher income and professional families who cannot, for various reasons, stay at home with their children. They may lack the skills of mothering, having perhaps been denied it themselves; their emotional needs may compel them to continue careers outside the home; they may be overwhelmed by the care of an emotionally ill, retarded, or physically handicapped child who needs professional care and support. These mothers, too, can benefit, just as the poorer families can, by the supportive, as well as the developmental, aspects of day care.

More and more in these programs, we are coming to realize the value they have as family-centered, rather than solely child-centered services. Through consultation with parents, skillful and observant teachers and other professionals in day care programs can often help with needed family adjustments, through the child and his reactions to situations away from home.

Thus, though a child may be cared for apart from his family during the day, good day care services can often be a preventive service--a means of helping to preserve the family, which is one of our major goals--and at every income level.

So we see that the family able to pay on a sliding scale for the day care of their children can and should be able to profit as much from the many child caring skills incorporated in good day care as should the same family who may have the same problems, but no financial ability to sustain them.

Preliminary reports from a study on Child Care Arrangements of the Nation's Working Mothers, 1965,[35] sponsored by the Children's Bureau of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor, and conducted by the Bureau of the Census, with its national sample of households--which I will quote from time to time--show that 6.1 million mothers working full or part time have 12.3 million children under the age of 14.

Most of these mothers, or 86 percent, declared that they worked solely for economic reasons; they were either the only family support or had to work to supplement their husbands' inadequate incomes. Women also worked for special reasons: to help buy a home, to pay for medical care, or to contribute toward a child's education.

Only 14 percent gave such "noneconomic" reasons as: they just liked to work, needed to use the education and skills they had, or simply preferred work to home and the company of adults to children.

And what is happening to the children? There is no need to dwell on the obvious newspaper headlines of those children who are left uncared for or in the charge of incompetent or cruel custodians. There are the horror stories about children left unattended burning in fires, of those who were kept from harm by being chained to bedposts, or put under sedation, or left to the unreliable care of immature brothers or sisters.

We know the results of the problem, and we also know the sad fact of life that even if all parents wanted to supply model day care for their children, it would simply not be available to them.

---

[35] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Welfare Administration, Children's Bureau and U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau: CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS OF THE NATION'S WORKING MOTHERS, 1965. Washington, D.C. 20201: Children's Bureau, 1965. 14 pp. (Processed.)

But it is up to us to find a spectrum of services in day care for this spectrum of problems--and to implement our findings.

First, let us look at the situation from the aspect of age groups. We find that, apart from inadequate resources at all age levels, the most deprived groups of children are either too young or too old.

The infant and child to the age of 3 must be home with the mother, society has decreed; the older child when he gets to school can take care of himself during nonschool hours, it is believed. Group day care services for the very young and the older school age child have been almost nonexistent. The young adolescent 13 and 14 has literally no day care services adapted to his need.

And now I want to say that it is time for us, not just the community as a whole, but professionals and leaders, to look at this situation for which we are largely to blame. For while the public does not always go where we say, it often looks where we point.

The Children's Bureau and other leaders, in their profound belief in supporting the mother-child relationship, have discouraged any separation in the early years. We have followed inconclusive and groping scientific opinion that, in the past, has advised against mother-child separation in these early child developmental stages. This has been abetted by society's old dictum, "The woman belongs in the home." Thus we, too, have maintained that the mother belongs with the child in the home under any circumstances--as long as that home survives, I might add.

But experience and research by leading psychiatrists and child care experts have revised that narrow gauge viewpoint. Now, most careful investigators tell us that it is deprivation or a deficit of mothering, not a separation from the mother, that harms the young child. It is the quality of the relationship, be it between mother and child, surrogate mother and child, or even institution and child, that is important.

Reality also has forced us to revise our attitude. As often as we have insisted that the well-being of the young child depends on the mother remaining in the home, she has continued in increasing number to work outside the home. We have been forced to acknowledge that the hand that rocks the cradle must often also punch the time clock.

We know that mothers of infants are working and must work. At this very minute, the new study tells us, 13 percent of all children of the nearly 10 million working mothers are under 3 years of age.

When they come to us to place their children in day care so they may work at their jobs, they come up against a stern wall of disapproval behind which is a vacuum of services. This vacuum has been left by our failure to admit one of the important facts of our society: that these women need to work and, as much as they and their families may need the added income, they are needed just as much by the society in which they live and the society which we are pledged to provide services to support.

This picture is complicated by an ambivalence of public opinion. Legislators and the public complain about relief rolls, with the aid to dependent mothers and families receiving the brunt of the attack. When mothers stay home and take public funds to support themselves and their children, they are censured as shiftless; when they take jobs to try to become self-supporting, they are charged with neglecting or even deserting their children. The demands of the labor market also create this perplexing ambivalence. The very industrialist who personally believes that the woman should remain in the home hires women in increasing numbers. In fact, the Department of Labor projects an increase of 43 percent more women with preschool age children in the labor forces by 1970. Even the tide of automation has not changed the steady increase in the number of working women and mothers.

So we have failed to grasp the obvious and to seek solution for it. Whatever our feelings may be on the subject, vast numbers of mothers of infants are working.

And their children? Infants are being cared for inadequately, often under careless and even dangerous conditions, by slightly older children who themselves should be in care; by indifferent or infirm relatives, friends, or neighbors; by some negligent, if not unscrupulous, free-lancers in the day care field who are unlicensed and unfit.

Because we have not believed in the principle of out-of-home group care for infants, we too have been negligent. While the problem grew with the expanding number of working mothers, we refused to act because we thought that any solution except keeping the mother in the home or the infant in a substitute home was improper.

In some States, family day care for the infant and young child has been developed with the help of new Federal funds. More are being licensed and supervised. But this is new. Mostly, mothers have had to find their own makeshift arrangements because our whole philosophy has been to sweep the problem of infant day care under the rug of disapproval.

It concerns me, for example, as I travel throughout the country, that people do not seem disturbed by the ads I see for "washing, ironing, and child care."

But times change and so--miraculously sometimes--do we. We have to change when we see that there are more than 1-1/2 million children of working mothers who are under the age of 3. Funds have become available recently to help find answers where there were only questions. Child welfare funds are now available for research and demonstration to find effective ways of caring for these children.

More recently, the Children's Bureau has recognized that not only family care, but group care can be explored for this age group--and we are now able to do it.

Under our program of Research and Demonstration Grants, two projects have been undertaken for program study at the State University of New York at Syracuse and at Yale University.

The program at Syracuse, a day care project known as "Children's Center," has been set up to provide demonstration of quality group care for children between the ages of 6 months and 3 years.

Planned for children of working mothers of the lower socioeconomic group, the study aims at providing the best care, while screening out any possible detrimental factors of maternal deprivation within the institutional setting.

Dr. Julius B. Richmond, Chairman of the Department of Pediatrics there and Program Director of the new Head Start Project within the poverty program which aims to foster preschool educational opportunities for deprived youngsters, is a director of the Center. Dr. Richmond, a distinguished participant in this conference, believes that an environment can be programmed to meet these requirements while also providing enrichment these children might otherwise not receive in their own homes during this critical period of learning.

If day care opportunities for the younger infant and child are lacking, absence of resources is bleakness itself for the older child. And by older children, I mean those veterans of 6 to 14 years. Provision for these children seem to shrink with their growth; they become the latch key kids, the stoop-sitters, the street corner dawdlers, prone to health and safety hazards and easy marks for delinquency.

We were shocked when we discovered in a 1958 Children's Bureau census study that 400,000 children under 12 of working mothers were left to fend for themselves during the day. Now, preliminary results of the special study I mentioned earlier--which is not entirely analagous in scope and method to the 1958 one, but which I offer you as some basis of comparison--show that nearly a million youngsters under the age of 14 are on their own during nonschool hours of the day.

The school age child is more liable to suffer from a lack of day care than is the preschool child because he may seem less vulnerable and better able to care for himself. The "only 3 hours in the afternoon" that he is not in school and must fend for himself when no other provisions are made for him may seem to be insignificant. Yet these are 3 hours when he feels on his own, perhaps thinking that nobody cares where he is or what he does. This is not only emotionally disturbing to him, but since he feels no one cares what he does, he may do anything, including get into bad company and trouble.

I think we must look for ways to fill this gap in care, as child care people in other cultures have been doing. For example, in Denmark a state program of planned leisure time activity has been in effect long enough to cause child welfare experts to wonder if it has not contributed to the low delinquency rate in that country.

There has been a general belief that the best way to provide day care for these youngsters, until their mothers return from work, is through group activity or group care. Yet, here is a child who has been in a group in school the better part of his day.

Are there no more imaginative ways of offering variety in caring for these youngsters than on the wholesale basis? When the child is through school for the day, he is generally ready to go home, even though he may just "raid the ice box" and run right out again to play.

Might not family care in his own neighborhood with a nonworking mother serving as an interim mother help reduce the sense of rootlessness that the latch key youngster may experience? Might it not be possible, in some instances, for day care groups to rent apartments in certain neighborhoods, hiring qualified women to serve in the working mothers' stead during after school hours?

Traditionally, the child between the ages of 3 and 6 gets the most day care services. There are about 2-1/4 (2.2) million children of working mothers in this group. As the most frequently offered day care service, the work with this age group has emphasized the need to strengthen health, educational, and social welfare programs for these youngsters.

But, in addition to the regular programs, we must recognize specialized needs and must fit the services to the circumstances. More often than not, we are faced by such social complexities as the one-parent family.

Take just one case among thousands on the records of one large city day care division. The young mother was unmarried and her son was 3 when she finally came to the attention of the day care division. The mother was on public assistance; she was suffering from acute depression. She felt guilty because she had the child; she was frustrated because having the child had kept her from completing her education.

The psychiatric social worker at the out-patient clinic where the mother was seen recommended day care for the child during the course of the treatment she needed. The boy was entered in a city day care center; the mother continued her treatment, and after she completed it, she resumed her business course, received high marks, good recommendations, and a job.

And the child, who had suffered through infancy with an unhappy, unstable mother had adjusted in the day care center and profited from the many health, educational, and socializing opportunities that had been lacking in his own home environment.

Both mother and child continue to improve in their present life at home. As in many other instances of help through day care, this story not only demonstrates the benefits received by infants and parents, but carries within it the problems of the working mother, the unmarried mother, and the emotional and economic disruptions that can be caused by a complex problem left unsolved.

It points up a fact that we must realize: We are not always dealing with the shiny-faced, ideal American family, but with many homes facing many complexities. As in this case, we know that there are many one-parent households that are homes regardless of their composition. We know that women without husbands living in the home are twice as likely to enter the labor force as are those in regular family situations. We also know, without statistics, that these women are likely to have more problems than others. We must be prepared to deal with them and their children who may not be families as society defines the term, but who, nonetheless, are families and should be given all opportunities to survive.

Special emphasis here has always been placed on early childhood education programs since this is considered an age in which preschool learning is particularly valuable. Here, as in all day care, the emphasis should be on providing programs that meet the needs of the individual child and on helping to develop family strengths and rapport through the child and his needs. As I mentioned before, consultation with parents by teachers and other professionals, who observe the child and his reactions to various life situations, can serve as a preventive factor in potential emotional disturbances in the child and disruption in family functioning.

We cannot afford to overlook the opportunity day care has to offer parents in terms of greater insight and skills in child rearing practices, since day care deals not only with the child's education, but ranges all the way from concrete problems, such as nutrition, to his introduction into group experience.

Another project being sponsored by Children's Bureau funds is now underway at Howard University here in Washington. This day center for families with incomes under $3,000 is a research and demonstration grant project that includes the parents in this crucial preschool education period. At the center, parents not only consult about their children and learn new aspects of child rearing, but they, too, take part in learning new home skills and crafts.

Apart from the special needs of age groups and of children of working mothers--needs that cut across all classes of youngsters requiring day care--there are those children with special problems for which day care must find highly specialized programs that require more than merely the best that we want from the usual programs.

The deficits in education, socialization, health, and in purely material assets suffered by the victims of racial and cultural discrimination are well known to us. We know that our country, and particularly its child serving institutions, have much to make up for in assisting what we term the "culturally deprived" child.

It is not discrimination to admit that these children lag behind more fortunately born youngsters. They are the products of discrimination, of inferior education, of economically and socially deprived families.

For these children, we must do what our whole society must be pledged to do: to intensify services--in our case, day care--for these groups; to seek them out; to provide individual programs; to increase the ratio of well-qualified adults to children.

We are looking hopefully to the exciting new Head Start program to provide imaginative ways of filling the deplorable social and educational void suffered by so many of our nation's poverty stricken youngsters, through summer and subsequent year-round programs for the preschool group. We hope that with such special programs and with expansion of the more familiar day care programs, we may eventually be able to cover all the unmet needs, geographically and otherwise.

Such groundbreaking and intensive programs must be provided in order to help bring these youngsters to their educational and emotional potentialities. Psychological guidance in these centers is imperative, both for the youngsters and for those teachers and others who work with them and administer both day care and Head Start programs.

Among our most culturally deprived are the children of migrant workers. They must be pursued for their care and education as relentlessly as their parents must pursue the crops in search of livelihood.

New and appropriate ways must be developed to meet their needs. But the problem is an immense one, characterized by need and complicated by its lack of boundaries. It is estimated that 150,000 children follow the crops with their parents in 47 States, often moving a thousand miles or more in one trek. At best, more stable workers may stay in one harvest area for as long as 5 or 6 months, working the new crops as they come along.

The plight of their children is unique in our country. They have little or no educational background; their families are often illiterate and may give them little basic support toward education; the school authorities often look the other way rather than try to enforce school attendance that would undoubtedly be of short duration.

Besides physical deprivation, these families suffer acute discrimination in the communities where they work; they do not approach the authorities for many of their rights because many do not know their rights. Most actually live in fear of authority. Residence laws balk their obtaining of assistance in most States.

Day care seems to be one form of help that the migrant workers will accept and even seek. While many do take their young children into the fields to work, others are greatly concerned that they are growing up without care or education. Residence restrictions do not bar their access to these programs.

Day care must be designed to fit the needs and the experience of these youngsters. Imaginative ways must be found to reach them; workers must set up day care in the camps and fields if need be. While it is good to be able to introduce books, toys, and experiences the child has never known at these early and impressionable ages, it may also be necessary to experiment with materials that he may more readily understand, that suit his background and fit more easily into outdoor camps than into urban playgrounds and centers. Care of infants of migrants presents special problems we must tackle.

Although their problems are individual ones, physically and emotionally handicapped and mentally retarded children have, in common, some basic disability that makes their isolation even more crucial in an area where needs exist even for the so-called normal child.

These are the physically and emotionally handicapped and the mentally retarded children. Their disabilities complicate their placement in day care. And these disabilities are often not their only problems. They, too, may have working mothers, broken families, and social, economic, and educational stresses that only compound the handicaps for them and their families.

Specially trained teachers, play and educational tools to meet the needs of their particular handicaps, more specialized medical supervision and services, close work with families--these are only a few of the mere necessities of a day care program for children in these groups.

The question will constantly arise as to the wisdom of placing these children in regular day care programs. This is a matter of the ability of the individual child to adjust to programs with children who do not share his handicap, and it means careful screening and even more individualized instruction and care.

Again, as in day care for the nonhandicapped child, here the role of the center and its personnel with the parents is even more crucial. The case of the mentally retarded youngster perhaps illustrates this need most poignantly.

We have all experienced, somewhere in our lives, the tortures of the family with the retarded youngster. We know first hand, from friends or relatives, the family disruption, the sense of guilt, the conflict about the advisability of putting the child in an institution. There is often conflict between parents on the right course of action; there are worries concerning the effects the presence of the retarded child may have on other children in the family.

A well-qualified day care center for such a child can relieve many stresses and frictions in the home by more than just the physical removal of the child during the day and the respite that this can give to a tense family situation.

Special skills of the professional teacher of the retarded can be passed on to the family, along with advice on rearing practices that may relieve guilt feelings and uncertainties and aid the child's development and adjustment in his community and family. Within the center itself, the child can learn about social relationships that may have been unwillingly denied him by his own family. With this kind of help, a family has often been able to resolve conflicts and keep the child in the home.

With all the inherent difficulties in such programs for the handicapped, this, too, is a day care question that we must answer--and well--in all special groups. We know that such programs may well mean the difference between keeping these children in their own families and placing them in institutions.

And so we see, there is a vast spectrum of need for day care services. There will probably be more problems that have not yet appeared on our spectrum. We must ask ourselves what we can do to fill present needs and to prepare ourselves for those to come, as they surely will.

I believe it is true that there is a total of more children in this country today from all social and economic groups who need day care more than any other single child welfare service. We in the Children's Bureau see it as a need for youngsters from birth to adolescence--a service in pursuit of prevention and cure for a multitude of problems.

Your presence at this joint conference demonstrates your belief that we can work together toward our mutual goals.

luncheon address

RESEARCH ADDS NEW DIMENSIONS TO DAY CARE SERVICES FOR CHILDREN

MILTON J. E. SENN, M.D. Child Study Center, Yale University

ADVOCATES OF DAY CARE CENTERS for children under 5 years of age can point to various substantial benefits from such services. For many years, their primary goal was the provision of custodial care and protection for children whose parents, for one reason or another, were unable to fully carry this responsibility. In periods of wartime stress, when women were particularly encouraged to work outside the home, the government placed emphasis on suitable arrangements for the wholesome care of young children.

Today, "suitable arrangements" for children has come to mean significantly more than "babysitting" provisions. The aims of the modern day care center have broadened with the criteria that a center of good quality must afford an opportunity to a child to be assisted, according to his individual needs, not only physically but also emotionally, intellectually, and socially, in methods supplementary to his home and family life. Increasingly, day care is being viewed not only as protective and supportive, but educational as well.

Present day care centers for children are becoming cognizant that research has strikingly revealed a new dimension--the educational potentials of young children. I shall confine my remarks to a consideration of this factor, namely that care of prekindergarten age children in day care centers can be, and in fact must be, educational if their full value is to be realized.

Persons doing research in child development have, for a long time, given attention to problems of the young child, his behavior, his learning, and his emotional development. Those investigators, by designing experiments to disclose how children learn, have established several hypotheses. I will mention only two of them, and then illustrate some of the important research pertinent to our concern today.

> The first hypothesis is that children under 5 years, even as early as infancy, are innately ready to absorb basic skills which are prerequisites in learning to read, write, and understand mathematics. The utilization of educational practices appropriate to the learning potential of infants and young children can promote later learning, and increase motivation to attend school and to achieve academic success.
>
> The second hypothesis is that children who are deprived of adequate and intellectual stimulation in the years under 5 are likely to develop severe learning problems later on when they attend school, making them prone to become truants, to drop out of school entirely, and to become delinquents.

Let us examine some of the research proving the validity of hypothesis number one, namely that children under 5 years are ready to learn basic skills which are prerequisites in learning to read, write, and understand mathematics. A vast amount of research in the field of cognitive studies has followed the pioneering work of the Swiss biologist-psychologist Piaget [36] whose theories of how children learn developed from his detailed, day-by-day observations of his own three children in Geneva. Piaget described stages of intellectual development beginning in the first 5 months of life and carried forward into adolescence.

He reasoned that there were certain critical periods in the life of each infant and child. In the beginning, the child's brain and nervous system in general were capable only of receiving a variety of sensory stimulations--through the eyes, ears, and skin particularly--through which the infant's nervous system was able to automatically coordinate his neurological reflexes. But repeated experiences at looking for things *heard*, of reaching for and grasping things *seen*, of sucking *things grasped*, not only helped his brain to develop but brought him pleasure which, in turn, motivated him to seek further stimulation. Starting with a signal from outside like a noise, a cycle was set up which prompted the baby to become alerted, to turn his eyes and his head, and as he was able to see the source of the noise, he found pleasure. Such pleasure prompted him not only to be alert for more pleasure, but even to try to initiate it himself by using his hands or his voice.

---

[36] Piaget, Jean: THE PSYCHOLOGY OF INTELLIGENCE. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1950. 182 pp.

In the second 6 months of life, the baby is able to experience a greater variety of situations which he increasingly recognizes, in which he develops an interest, and on which he can act in a manner that either prolongs or reproduces that which interests him. This is the period when babies recognize their parents, smile appropriately, and begin to establish emotional attachments. If such an attachment is to one person alone, the baby shows anxiety at separation. From this standpoint, mothering by more than one person, such as day care provides, may have the advantages of inoculating the child against separation anxiety, building into him a more finely differentiated set of perceptual ability, thereby widening his range of curious interest in human behaviors.

The third stage in Piaget's schema is that from 10 to 18 months of age, when the child begins to explore and to try out his new found muscle development, and to learn the effects of his efforts. For example, as he has opportunity to throw things and watch their trajectory, as he has an opportunity to climb and walk freely, to manipulate objects, he begins to develop conceptions of space, time, and causality. As parents are able to mesh into the child's natural proclivities to use his body in exploration, by talking to him, by playing with him and giving him the opportunities to experiment with various objects, they enhance his performance as well as his development.

In this period when the child's play is very often imitative and is not yet the result of his own conceptualizing or preplanning, it is found that given a greater variety of models to imitate, his skills increase, not only for the play at hand but in intellectual performance later on. As J. McVicker Hunt of the University of Illinois states, "Evidence independent of Piaget's observations for this point are hard to come by," but experiences in several schools lend some degree of confirmation. For example, the headmistress of a small private coeducational school in Rhode Island believed that the basis for arithmetic can be taught in the nursery school and kindergarten. She considered it unfortunate that children are often introduced to addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division before they have had sufficient opportunity to discover at the concrete level what these operations mean. In consequence of her opinion, the teachers of children 3, 4, and 5 years of age encouraged their young pupils to play games containing concrete number experience. Thus, playing games in which blocks were arranged in rows and columns to form rectangles, or another of three-dimensional buildings, gave the teachers opportunity to talk about areas, numbers of stories in buildings, to count the number of blocks, etc.

Such talk was aimed not only at communicating enthusiasm, but also at helping the children to make useful discriminations. Time was regularly given for such games everyday, and the teachers would ask questions about the number of rows, the number of columns, in a way which would reinforce the children's interest and knowledge about figures. By kindergarten age, these children could define what was meant by an area and volume, not as physicists might, but nevertheless in definitions which had pertinence and meaning to the teacher and the children. In the first grade, these children were also given repeated opportunity to learn to use figures, when they played store, using play money in addition, subtraction, and so on.

The payoff in competence from such teaching became evident not immediately but when these children reached higher stages of learning in the fifth grade. The testing of these children and comparison with past results of children from the same background and environment who had not had this experience showed no special benefits to them by the time they reached third grade. However, by the time they had reached fifth grade, this group of children tested higher on the achievement tests. Obviously, it was impossible to separate the effects of the nursery school experience from the techniques of teaching used in the grades, but the fact that those children who had not had the nursery school experience did less well than those who had matriculated through the nursery school indicates that the early experience was probably a factor.

The British publication THE LANCET, in April 1965, calls attention to the revolution in the "2 Rs" via the infant schools, termed "the most boldly experimental sector of British education."[37] Here the new math concepts are used where children play with rods of differing lengths representing units one to ten, through which they are gradually introduced to activities that help them grasp how smaller numbers can be combined to make larger numbers, and how larger numbers can be decomposed into smaller ones. In the new initial teaching alphabet of 24 traditional letters and 30 new symbols (I.T.A.) introduced by Sir James Pitman in 1959, young children have secured a dependable base to master the relation between symbol and sound. The conclusions of THE LANCET are "that infant logic may not be adult logic, but it is valid within its range. . . . It is beginning to look as if our infants can understand a good deal more than we supposed. They are not ready for formal instruction: they are ready for mastering the fundamentals of number and language in a climate of informality, play, and discovery."

Other researchers also have found that children have the ability to profit from experience which is appropriate and which meshes with their innate scheme of biological development, exemplified in studies by Baldwin, Kalhorn, and Breese.[38] Studying children between the ages of 4 and 7 years, or what Piaget calls the intuitive phase of learning, when a child is continually bringing his intuitions in correspondence with reality, these researchers found that children who are reared in families where parents take the pains to understand the child's questions, explain to him the reasons for actions, and discuss with him the nature of things, show a more rapid rate of intellectual development than children whose parents ask for unquestionable obedience, that children be only seen and not heard.

In addition to the laboratory research reported, there is much evidence which might be called clinical, stemming from the work of teachers in good nursery schools, especially in various universities where they serve as laboratory schools in departments of child development. Such educators, for many years, have been impressed with the preschool child's native curiosity, his motivation to learn, his ability to ask basic questions, and his freedom to experiment. When these traits have been assisted and promoted by providing learning experiences in the use of objects to give these children understanding of the physical properties of objects--such as flatness and roundness, bigness and smallness--and when they were permitted to use their muscles spontaneously in games and in other group activities, their total learning seemed stimulated. In other words, it has been shown that children who are stimulated through their sense organs--the eyes, the ears, the skin--begin to learn not only about the things in the world which surround them and with which they have daily contact, but they begin to learn about symbols and the interpretation of symbols in reading and writing.

---

[37] Revolution in the 2 Rs. [In] THE LANCET, 1965, [Vol. 1 for 1965], 850-851 (April 17).

[38] Baldwin, Alfred L.; Kalhorn, Joan; and Breese, Fay Huffman: Patterns of Parent Behavior. [In] PSYCHOLOGICAL MONOGRAPHS, 1945, Vol. 58. (75 pp.)

Although all this looks like child's play, not education, physiologists agree with Piaget that the development of the central nervous system of the brain and of the mind proceeds in a healthy fashion only when there is adequate and appropriate stimulation in the sensory organs. Cognition, reasoning, ability to read and write follow the development of language, and this comes only through contact with people who talk, and in other ways communicate well. It follows then that the kind of experience received by a preschool child in a day care center or nursery school is far removed from the custodial service of other times, but is now an indispensable support for his future individual growth and success.

What is the evidence to support hypothesis number two, namely that children who are deprived of adequate intellectual stimulation in the years under 5 are likely to develop severe learning problems later on?

There have been many studies of infants in institutions, such as orphanages, showing that retardation of the intelligence follows where there is a lack of stimulation in the early months of life.

Studying older children, those who were nonlearners in the first three grades of school, a group of investigators at Purdue University found that 20 percent of the children with "learning to read" disabilities had problems of perception. They did not have diseases of the eye, or refraction problems, but they were handicapped by what these investigators called "motor generalizations." They could not visualize objects in space as one ordinarily does; they had improper awareness of themselves as objects in space; and they were uncoordinated in the use of their hands and feet. In other words, children who do not have this relatedness of themselves in space are, to some degree, like infants. Because of these deficiencies, they cannot see symbols on the printed page; they cannot distinguish letters, words, phrases, and sentences in a manner making it possible to see them sequentially and in a related fashion. Although these children appeared like some who are brain-damaged at birth, or suffer from childhood psychoses, none had such a history, and by gross neurological examination they seemed normal. When these children were given special exercises involving the muscles used in throwing and in handling objects, as did Piaget with infants, they became better coordinated muscularly and visually. In time, they began to learn to read, to write, and to use mathematical symbols correctly.

The Purdue researchers believed that these perceptual difficulties might have been detected in prekindergarten schools if the children had been observed closely in their everyday play. More important, such children could have been aided prophylactically with appropriate sense stimulation and exercises for motor-muscle development so that when they reached the time for formal instruction in reading, they would have been physiologically ready and would have made progress instead of becoming nonreaders.

Several important studies of school failure in the first five grades have shown that the basic difficulty in these children is an inability to communicate because they have problems in speaking and in understanding words spoken to them. These children had no anatomical defects of the nervous sytem, of hearing or vision, or of the vocal apparatus, but they did suffer from a deficiency in function which resulted from a lack of stimulation, especially the experience of being spoken to and responding with language.

In studying these children, a style of family life is observed in which the relationships of parents to the children is such that use of language is not developed or encouraged. For example, instead of giving a child an explanation to his questions, he is simply given a reply of yes, or no, or maybe just a nod of the head or, even worse, a harsh injunction against "talk." There is no model of speech and no clues as to how to use words in response, or as to ways of articulating ideas by the use of appropriate words, phrases, and sentences. Although mealtimes in most families are occasions for conversation, in many of the families studied this is not so. Either there is no family gathering for mealtime, or when parents and children come together, they do not talk. While this is more true of the more disadvantaged lower social classes, such cultural deprivation is also found in some middle class families where, for some reason or another, conversation is kept to a minimum.

Children from fatherless homes, in some of the studies, showed significantly lower I.Q. scores by the time they got to the fifth grade than did children who came from intact families. The researchers ascribed this deficiency not so much to the absence of the father as to a diminution of organized family activity. Such children who started out with an inability to communicate with their parents accumulated their deficiencies as time went on, so that by the time they were in the fifth grade they had severe learning problems, and communication was almost impossible between them and their teachers.

Such children were frequently passed on from one grade to another, as unfinished articles on an assembly line. In time, something gave way. The child got into trouble, often attended school irregularly, became a truant, got into difficulties with the law, and finally left school entirely. Most children who come to the juvenile courts are found to have learning problems, many of them not being able to learn to read, even though they are well along in age. This is not because they are mentally retarded, but because they have not received the proper stimulation and other advantages of learning to speak and to use their minds and bodies appropriately from infancy onward.

Beginning with the studies of Piaget and going through the great numbers of American psychological studies, particularly of scientists interested in the development of cognition, the conlusion has been reached that for academic learning to be successful it must be viewed as developing in a continuum, beginning with infancy and early childhood. All the early learning experiences, those intellectually stimulating as well as those emotionally satisfying, tend to foster good learning later on. Each child learns by phases or stages, and if any one of these is unfinished, there is a block in his intellectual functioning, in his progress of learning. These interruptions may be due to physical illness, economic and social deprivation, lack of stimulation as I have already described, or emotional illness in a child or in his parents.

Longitudinal studies of child development carried on by a number of research centers have shown that the major development of personality takes place in the early years. By the age of 2 years, certain trends are already evident, at least in such matters as intellectual interest, dependency, and aggressivity in adolescence. Just as there is a spurt in the development of a child's height in his first 5 years of life, so is there a spurt in intellectual development when conditions are optimally right to benefit this part of his development. This is not to say that all learning potential is tapped or cultivated to its utmost by the age of 5 years. A considerable amount of change still takes place in the personality, behavior, and intellectual development later on, again depending on the opportunities provided each individual. But it is very likely that the greatest receptivity for one's innate potential exists in the first few years of life, a time which is uncluttered with nonessentials. It is as if the seeds had already sprouted and needed cultivation, with some growth assured but with the greatest growth guaranteed through appropriate and designed techniques for intellectual nurturance, given by persons who are affectionate, kindly, and sympathetic to the needs of a growing child.

The day care center can supply in a supplementary fashion those elements which are lacking in the home. Even where the home is more or less ideal, a good day care center can still complement its efforts. The further dimensions which research has contributed to the fostering of child growth and development can be, and is being, incorporated into existing day care centers and nursery schools as their significance and value become apparent.

Just as levels of high and low quality exist in other educational systems, the same degree of variance can be found in day care centers and nursery schools. In those day care centers which cannot be optimally beneficial to a child, it is imperative that they do nothing which is detrimental to a child physically, intellectually, socially, or emotionally. It is not inconceivable that certain unfortunate day care or nursery school experiences may be seriously disturbing to children, according to evidence from the clinical field of child psychiatry. This is obviously not the model we are concerned with in this conference, except as to how it gives us due warning of pitfalls and dangers. If we follow the standards set by the Children's Bureau, we may be assured that children and families who need such care will gain much, not only for themselves but for all other people with whom they make up a community.

The recognition that each of us survives for better or worse in terms established by the community of man--on local, national, and world scales--is the kernel of truth to be grasped. The very heart of many social measures now being initiated to tackle the ills of poverty, neglect, ignorance, and human waste is not that they are new phenomena, not that they trigger the "better or worse" for the individual man, but the cognition that the entire community of man depends on what happens in the beginning, what we do for our infants and children--the questions which bring us to this city and to this conference.

Subconference D
ADMINISTRATION AND PERSONNEL

keynote
address

ORGANIZATION PROBLEMS IN EXPANDING DAY CARE SERVICES*

JOHN NEIMEYER President, Bank Street College of Education

WHEN GREAT OPPORTUNITY KNOCKS, there's always the possibility that the lives involved will respond, rise to the occasion, and flourish greatly; and there's also the possibility that these lives may be completely disrupted. I think we face these alternatives today, in regard to the Head Start program that will be initiated this summer.

Two years ago, when I spoke at a convention of the National Association of Nursery Education, now reorganized as the National Association for the Education of Young Children, I threw out this challenge: that all groups concerned with preschool education should band together and work toward the goal of providing enough child development centers, child care centers, in this country to accommodate every preschool child.

I was inspired to make this challenge by my experience in New Zealand and Australia, where it is common for as many as

---

*This is a partial text of Mr. Neimeyer's remarks at the Keynote Session, Subconference D--Administration and Personnel.

80 percent of all young children to be in various preschool education groups.

We in this field in our country must be more daring in setting our goals, I decided. And I considered this challenge an extremely daring, and extremely audacious, concept. In fact, I thought about it for a long time before I came out and said it. I wondered if I wanted to get out on that limb. I wondered if we could all get out on that limb.

Little did I realize that only 2 years later we'd be planning to place about 500,000 preschool children in Project Head Start, that we'd be planning to spend $70 million on Head Start this summer, and another $150 million on continuation of this program.

For the summer alone, over half of the 300 poverty-stricken counties in the United States will have Head Start programs. For two States in particular, every single county will have a Head Start center.

This is an extension, an implementation, of the idea that someday we will reach every preschool child with education.

What's more, we can take pride in the fact that these Head Start centers will embody the three components of good day care--the education component, the social service component (service to the child and the family), and the medical care component.

It is wonderful and remarkable to me that we can, in one year, plan to pour more money into such centers--embodying those three components of good day care--than has probably been spent over the past three decades.

Whether we can rise to this great opportunity is the big question facing us today, for there surely are problems inherent in this movement.

One of our major problems is a lack of teachers. On all sides, we have heard discussions about the lack of trained teachers. In fact, it has perhaps sometimes seemed to us that our profession was being attacked for not preparing enough people for preschool education.

There are things we can do:

First, we must mount training programs, flexible ones that will help us rise to the occasion. But we must all be willing to change some of our preconceived ideas about how we train people--

- We need much more training on the job.
- We need much more opportunity to get people off by themselves for 1 month or 6 weeks for training, for intensive experiences in the field.
- We must be willing to change the requirements we've traditionally set up for trainees.

The people are available if we're prepared to take them. For instance, plans were being made recently for a number of day care centers around Cardozo High School here in Washington. Everyone was terribly concerned: Where would they find the teachers? Well, they did find them; they found plenty of them when word got out about the need. Who were the women? They were mostly women who had been previously trained, but who hadn't worked for years, who had been running their own homes. They were brought out to work by a sense of social mission plus the fact that now there was a job.

To use such people, we're going to have to make some adjustments, as institutions, regarding the requirements we've set up. We must provide better supervision on the job.

Now, I am reminded of the fact that not long ago, someone figured out that there is no place in this entire country that is not within a 2-hour drive of some group or institution containing highly sophisticated people in the day care field. Perhaps what we need is to have these people get in their cars, drive for 2 hours, and then sit down with the concerned people in the community and work with them to set up a child care center.

We must learn, too, to use the people living in the communities. There is a great reservoir of manpower in poverty areas that we know nothing about--mothers, grandfathers, teenagers. We must learn to use them. The extent of the possible roles of these people is bounded only by the imagination of those of us planning this kind of work.

What we need today are "Community Councils for Child Welfare." In communities where such councils exist, they must expand, reorganize, reach out and include all groups--churches, for instance, and other smaller local groups, even those groups running day care centers for profit.

Each such council must coordinate all community activities to plan a total program for child welfare.

And those of us in each individual organization must ask ourselves: What is our role in relation to the other groups? How can we cooperate? What can we contribute, and where can we give way? Let's remember there will be great competition for the dollar. Let's not bury our heads in the sand here. The only way we can solve this problem is by all of us sitting down together as sensible men and women and being willing to work together frankly and maturely.

If we can just see during each 6-month period an inching forward of gain in the overall program, we should be satisfied. And discouragement in any one phase should never make us talk of throwing in the towel.

ROUNDUPS

STATE AND CITY MEETINGS

ON THE LAST MORNING of the conference, 10 "roundup" sessions were held to consider regional and city problems in establishing day care programs and to discuss specific problems affecting different population groupings. The purpose of these sessions was to plan action back home in the communities of the participants.

Six of these sessions brought together people from the same geographical regions by States. The four "city" meetings included people from cities over 750,000; cities 500,000 to under 750,000; cities 100,000 to 500,000; cities less than 100,000.

No attempt will be made here to report these sessions in detail since many of the recommendations growing out of them coincided or were overlapping.

A broad range of recommendations advising specific Federal, State, and local programs to strengthen out-of-home day care for the nation's youngsters were proposed.

From the Federal standpoint, conference delegates especially sought guidance and clarification of the structure and planning of day care programs. They strongly advised that guidelines for needs be set forth to make the latest body of knowledge on day care available to all interested groups.

Federal funds similar to the matching funds under the Hill-Burton program for construction and renovation of day care centers were urged. Some delegates also asked strong consideration of open-end grants to States to allow them to take advantage of Federal funds for day care on a matching basis.

They stressed the need to create a strong sense of partnership between the Federal Government and the localities in order to prevent fragmentation in the overall development of services. Interpretation of social needs to communities and legislators was of major importance.

States were charged with organizing State and regional groups to review State day care administration and licensing laws; to abolish residence laws to assure provision of day care for the child of migrants and for other children who might be prevented from sharing in its benefits by these restrictions. Standards should be inclusive of all day care programs whether under public or voluntary auspices.

Day care should be available to all income levels and in both rural and urban areas. Day care centers should be incorporated in all public housing units. In localities, public agencies were advised to investigate the purchase of day care resources at cost from private agencies. Day care centers should be eligible for surplus food distribution on the same basis as public schools.

On the practical side, day care people were advised to study the power structure of the community to find out "who runs this town" and to work with the leaders. Key figures in business and labor were also cited as community leaders to be apprised of the needs and the advantages of day care and to be sought as allies in building programs.

Certain "common elements" make for success in achieving day care services for children whether the community is large or small, rural or urban. The process calls for (a) one or several citizens and professionals with a spark and a "mission," (b) a reaching out to and the imaginative involvement of agencies and citizens in a sustained effort, and (c) feedback for continuing interest and involvement.

In general, the conferees advised Federal, State, and local cooperation along with creative methods to interpret the needs of day care to the public.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE WORK GROUPS

RECOMMENDATIONS

THE CORE of any conference depends on the degree of opportunity members have for participation. The National Conference on Day Care Services was rich in such opportunities. The 24 work groups discussed a great variety of day care matters to which everyone contributed. Members spoke, listened, discussed, and differed.

To each subconference, keynote speakers provided a backdrop for the discussion. Luncheon speakers brought some special knowledge that was crucial to the discussion. Each work group emerged with many recommendations.

When put together, these recommendations project new dimensions for a national program of day care services. Back of them all seemed to be a conviction on the part of the conferees that the United States can and will support a day care program for children.

Mrs. Randolph Guggenheimer, President of the National Committee for the Day Care of Children, summarized the recommendations from the 24 work groups. She stated that they clearly showed strong interest throughout the country for speeding up the rate at which adequate day care services are now being provided.

Putting the needs of children first, the work groups through their recommendations stressed the variety of situations which create the necessity for good day care programs of many different kinds. Youngsters needing such aid come from many different levels of society, not only from the homes of the poor. Special assistance should be provided for youngsters suffering handicaps of many different kinds--physical, mental, emotional, as well as economic.

In developing programs, the delegates urged that parents be given an opportunity to participate in planning programs as well as in the ongoing activities of the program.

Labor and industry, participants observed, should do far more than they are doing in adjusting the hours of working mothers to permit them to provide better care for their children at the same time that they work to support the family and better its position in society.

A plea for increased funds from Federal, State, and local sources ran through the recommendations of all work groups, whatever their specific focus. These were tied to such goals as the raising of program standards, the provision of adequately trained personnel, the improvement of physical facilities, and increased programs of parent education.

Indicative of the complexity of the overall problem was the observation that for some families, day care is not the answer. What is required is night care or care in the child's own home. This would be needed in situations where the wage earner in a one-parent family must work on a night shift. Also important to children from families where the only parent present is the mother would be the inclusion of more men in day care programs--a fresh approach recommended by many participants at the meeting.

Meeting the needs of the whole child requires better integration of health, education, and welfare services. In the case of handicapped children, special services should be supplied. In many instances, these can and should be offered even within programs for the nonhandicapped.

The work groups urged more and better interpretation of day care services to the community at large. More involvements of members of boards and volunteers should be obtained in pushing for stronger action along these lines.

The recommendations which follow constitute the end result of the discussions in the various work groups.

With respect to

MOBILIZING THE COMMUNITY

We recommend that:

1. A concerted statewide effort be made to interpret day care and to combat ignorance, misinformation, and misunderstanding.

2. A sampling of the opinions of users of day care be made to assure that the community develops the kind of day care services it needs.

3. Factfinding regarding a community's needs and resources be used to combat negative feelings toward day care services. Bringing "the facts" to light often resolves objections.

4. Communities focus their day care programs on the educational, social, and developmental needs of children rather than on the needs of families.

5. State advisory committees, State departments of public welfare, education, and health be used for consultation in local efforts to establish day care services.

6. State and local health and welfare councils and committees be encouraged to participate more fully in planning day care services.

7. Members of boards and volunteers be involved in community action on day care, as well as in action to effect legislative change when appropriate.

8. Volunteers be seen as a resource for informing the community about the need for day care services as well as a means for enriching these services.

9. Administrators of day care services assume the responsibility of making day care needs known to interested and responsible public and private agencies and organizations and to involve them in planning.

10. Day care services be regarded as a community resource rather than as a welfare measure.

11. The National Committee for the Day Care of Children encourage local groups of citizens to set up chapters which will become centers of citizen action in the development of day care and nursery education programs.

12. The image of day care be projected so that communities become aware of their role in preventing social ills that are a drain on the economic and social resources of the community.

13. Members of boards seek to discover and eliminate overlapping of functions in order to facilitate more effective planning and use of day care services at both the State and local levels.

14. A "Children's Year" be proclaimed to emphasize the need for day care services for all children who could benefit from them. Such a proclamation would make communities aware of the importance of these services, and perhaps lead to sponsorship by the communities.

15. In the light of figures cited by Vice President Humphrey and others, public, voluntary, and proprietary day care programs be urged to make a massive effort in order to meet the broad-based needs for care of children in American society.

16. Space for day care centers be provided when large housing developments are built.

17. Support be given for increased resources to the Children's Bureau for consultation, planning, and financing for communities in developing their day care services with special emphasis on need for open end appropriations.

18. Sponsoring agencies of the National Conference on Day Care Services find ways for aiding an exchange of information about progress and problems as well as current developments and new demonstrations in day care across the country.

With respect to

COSTS AND FINANCING DAY CARE

We recommend that:

19. Further clarification be made available to communities planning day care programs regarding: operating principles of Titles II, III, and V of the Economic Opportunity Act; the 1962 Child Welfare Amendments; the possibility of purchase-of-care opportunities under these Federal provisions; and provision of funds for capital construction and equipment acquisition.
20. The Federal Land Clearance Authorities be asked to assist day care programs in obtaining, at no cost, long-term leases of land for new construction or expansion of day care facilities.
21. Persons interested in developing or expanding day care programs look, even for interim operating funds, to philanthropic foundations, corporate charitable trusts, and trust officers with responsibility for distribution of trust monies.
22. The problem of cost of day care services be viewed judiciously and realistically because of the general tendency to underestimate by excluding costs which, according to sound accounting procedure, should be considered.
23. Guidelines or models for facilities to be newly constructed for day care use, as well as for conversion of old facilities, be developed.

With respect to

VARIETY OF DAY CARE SERVICES

We recommend that:

24. Homemaker service be recognized as a service to be used along with day care, especially for the isolated family.

25. Emphasis be placed on the perceptual and cognitive needs of children in day care in order to supplement the traditional concern with physical, emotional, and social development.

26. The administration of day care facilities involve the health, educational, welfare, and safety services of each community.

27. There be a built-in evaluation of both group day care and family day care services.

28. Communities provide a range of services, from family day care to group day care, in order that the facility most appropriate to the needs of individual children and families will be available.

29. Social services be available as a part of day care service, recognizing however that every family who uses day care may not be in need of counseling.

30. Family day care be recognized as a desirable way of meeting the needs of children for short-term care, as well as long-term.

31. Experiments with new types of day care facilities and services be initiated.

For the culturally deprived

We recommend that:

32. Mobile clinics be considered as a way of bringing health services to deprived families in urban and rural areas since these families seldom seek medical care except in acute emergencies.

33. Greater flexibility of working schedules be provided for working mothers so that they can make better use of community resources.

34. The need for inservice training of staff be recognized--for professional, subprofessional, and community workers of many types--to prepare them to approach and involve parents of culturally deprived children.

35. More male participation be sought in day care services to provide the male image so often lacking for the culturally deprived child. Mature high school boys might be able to fill this need.

For the migrant family child

We recommend that:

36. The distinguishing characteristic of day care services for migrant children be flexibility, both in relation to program and to the hours of operation of the service.

37. Day care be available for migrant children under 3 years of age. Services may take the form of group care or family day care. Experimentation is urgently needed.

38. Particular services offered be carefully staffed to assure individualized attention to the child from the migrant family.

39. State laws or regulations prohibiting group care for the migrant family child under 3 years be waived or modified.

40. Residence and settlement laws, often deterrents to making community day care services and other health and welfare services available to migrant children and their families, be waived insofar as they affect the migrant family.

41. The care and protection offered by day care services be extended to the migrant family child who has not yet reached the age of 14, with special emphasis on education, recreation, health, and the development of social skills according to individual needs.

For the physically handicapped

We recommend that:

42. All physically handicapped children be evaluated by a diagnostic team directed by a physician prior to being placed in a day care center or family day care home.

43. In order to meet the desired goals, a continuum of health, education, and welfare services be planned and carried out to meet the changing needs of all children, especially the needs of those with physical handicaps.

44. Additional funds be allocated by the Congress for day care programs, some of the additional money to be allocated for day care programs for physically handicapped children. All additional funds should be used for (1) increased services; (2) demonstration projects; (3) research grants; (4) training of personnel--professional, volunteer, aides, and matrons.

45. Training funds be made available to ongoing community services for inservice training and institutes as well as to institutions of higher learning.

46. Specialized services for physically handicapped children be established in most communities.

47. More effort be made to place handicapped children in facilities serving normal children.

For the emotionally handicapped

We recommend that:

48. Day care services be integrated into the range of services required for children with emotional handicaps.

49. Day care for emotionally disturbed children include education, treatment, and, particularly important, relationship with the children's parents.

50. Teachers, nurses, etc. who work with children in day care centers for emotionally handicapped children receive special training.

51. Day care centers for emotionally disturbed children include school age and, particularly, adolescent children. The center should maintain a close relationship with the school.

52. The concept of day care be extended to infants under 1 year of age, especially infants from families in deprived environments which are likely to produce children with problems.

53. Screening for early distortions be made at well-baby clinics and in the offices of private pediatricians as a preventive of emotional illness.

54. Research be made to determine why some children from deprived environments develop normally while others do not. Knowledge gained from such research would be useful in deciding which children need day care services early.

For the mentally retarded

We recommend that:

55. Day care services be available to every retarded person who needs them, regardless of age.

56. In implementing the development and operation of day care services for the mentally retarded, interagency committees be developed at all levels of government.

57. Special attention be given by appropriate State agencies to the development of appropriate standards for day care services for the mentally retarded.

58. State government and local communities recognize their responsibilities for funding day care services for the mentally retarded.

59. All States become signatories of the interstate compact which will then assure day care services to all retarded individuals, regardless of legal residence.

60. Day care service programs always include, or make available through other agencies, services and orientation to the families of retarded children.

61. The agency providing the day care services program be able to provide, or have available through cooperative efforts with other agencies, the following ancillary

services: diagnosis and evaluation, health supervision, family counseling and family education, financial assistance toward tuition fees (where these exist), and referral to next-step programs.

62. Every State, in its current effort in mental retardation plans, review the specific problems of day care for the retarded and include recommendations on this subject in its final report. In the future continuation of statewide comprehensive mental retardation planning, a specific task force in day care for the mentally retarded should review the problem in depth, study and evaluate the needs in every community, and propose means of meeting these needs.

63. Less emotionally disturbed children be integrated into normal day care program.

For infants

We recommend that:

64. Child welfare workers place less emphasis on the necessity for constant parent-child relationships since this attitude serves as a deterrent to the development of group day care services for very young children.

65. Infants be separated from older children and that children be grouped according to their developmental levels.

66. Emphasis be placed on supplementary rather than on substitute care of children.

67. Family day care be developed and utilized when appropriate.

68. The family day care mother be sensitized to the cognitive needs of the infants under her care.

69. The family day care mother's salary meet at least the national hourly minimal wage standard.

For the child from 3 to 6

We recommend that:

70. Services to young children be determined by the need of the child, combining all disciplines involved into one service.

71. In group day care centers, there be one caretaker for every four children under 3 years of age.

For the school age child

We recommend that:

72. An extended day care program for school age children be made possible through the use of the plant, equipment, and other resources available to the community through the use of elementary school facilities.

73. Day care services for school age children, when auxiliary to a preschool program, be geared to the needs of the age group.

74. Family day care homes be used in the care of children beyond the preschool age level.

75. A commission be established to study and make recommendations regarding curriculum content, training, experience, and qualifications needed for school age day care service personnel.

76. Study and further exploration be made of the ways in which volunteers can be recruited, trained, and utilized constructively in the school age day care service program.

With respect to

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

We recommend that:

77. Training for leadership in parent education be a part of the curricula of schools of social work, schools of nursing, etc.

78. The importance of parents in the development and education of the children be stressed, and that day care centers be urged to recognize this importance in their programs.

79. Parent groups be organized by day care centers, such groups to be directed by professionally trained persons.

80. Parent involvement include opportunities to observe children in day care facilities and that training in observation techniques and methods be provided.

81. Day care facilities cooperate with other agencies to provide a spectrum of services for parents in order to facilitate their optimal role performance.

82. Parent involvement be an integral element in providing a variety of day care services in both urban and non-urban settings.

83. Methods be developed of involving parents other than in groups.

With respect to

ADMINISTRATION, SALARY SCALES, AND PERSONNEL POLICIES

We recommend that:

84. The need to maintain and upgrade health, welfare, and educational standards in day care centers be affirmed, but not in such a way as to sacrifice the initiative, involvement, use, and training of indigenous personnel.

85. Ways and means be developed for giving status to professional workers, including accreditation of teachers, and for developing good personnel practices with job descriptions and salary scales commensurate with positions of similar responsibility in the community.

86. Licensing requirements be effected which will upgrade standards.

87. A representative group in the community make a complete job study on all community agencies with job descriptions and salaries.

88. Administrators and personnel of day care centers and family day care be made aware of the availability of consultants from national, State, and local public and private agencies.

89. Training be given in day care administration.

With respect to

STAFF FOR DAY CARE SERVICES

We recommend that:

90. Provision be made for orientation and continued training of day care personnel.

91. State health, education, and welfare agencies increase their consultant staffs in order to make consultation from many specialists readily available to all day care services, whether under public or private auspices.

92. Communication now available about professional training be improved.

93. More scholarships be made available at the graduate level for day care personnel.

94. States provide for certification of teachers in early childhood education.

95. Experience in a day care center with adequate supervision be required for day care center teachers.

96. Established institutions of learning in communities be urged to provide training in day care.

97. A task force be set up to give national direction to training for day care.

98. Adult education centers be encouraged to provide refresher courses in day care.

99. Interdisciplinary experience be included in the training program.

100. Workers be prepared to understand all children, not just the poor or the handicapped.

101. Ways of giving status to day care workers be explored; use of mass media should be considered.

102. Boards and staff of day care centers give earnest consideration to incorporating a well-planned, individualized program of recruitment, selection, training, and supervicion of service volunteers in their agencies.

103. The public health nurse become an adjunct to the day care center in providing more and better health services to the children and consulting, when necessary, with their parents.

104. Social workers be a part of every day care service program.

For recruiting

We recommend that:

105. Courses in growth and development be given to high school girls and that didactic teaching is supplemented by actual experience in day care centers.

106. Courses in child care be offered to high school dropouts and graduates in order to increase the supply of child care workers.

107. In order to recruit family day care homes, the low fee scale now prevalent in many communities be altered to permit higher boarding rates.

For training and education

We recommend that:

108. Public agencies assume the responsibility of establishing training programs for day care staff.

109. Day care centers be used for training a variety of persons at different occupational levels.

110. Regular inservice training courses be provided for child care workers in day care centers.

111. Training opportunities be expanded with better communication about professional training currently available, and that training be made more available in established community institutions of learning.

112. Professional training be "people centered" with State certification for teachers in early childhood education provided, together with scholarships available on the graduate level.

113. Curriculum include interdisciplinary approach to day care with courses in child growth and development, social work, health, and experience in day care centers under adequate supervision as part of professional training.

114. Another title be found for the "subprofessional" worker as this title carries a connotation of inadequacy for some people.

115. A training plan be developed in every State for less than professional workers which would take into account the needs of those in continuing employment.

116. Professional training be made available for those with ability and the necessary educational background.

117. Courses in child development incorporated into the curriculum of social workers, students of medicine, and other professional disciplines, and vice versa.

118. Institutions of higher learning and professional organizations be urged to provide programs for the training of day care service personnel.

For volunteers

We recommend that:

119. Wherever volunteers are used, specific preservice and inservice training programs be provided.

120. Volunteers in day care programs have orientation and supervision and, in addition, have the opportunity for training so that the volunteer experience can become a career ladder. This applies not only to volunteers but also to parents and service-maintenance workers in day care centers.

With respect to

LICENSING AND STANDARDS

We recommend that:

121. Regular day care centers and specialized centers intensify their efforts to meet high standards of care.

122. Day care centers be required to be licensed by the appropriate State agency or agencies before receiving any Federal or State funds.

123. Standards, regulations, and protective services be assured for children of all ages in need of day care services.

124. Standards be developed through wide community representation of professionals, lay persons, operators, and parents with appropriate legal review to assure constitutionality, minimum requirements for licensure, and desirable standards.

125. To extend protection of licensing to all children, exemptions be eliminated.

126. State licensing acts give authority to a single State agency to administer licensing requirements in day care programs.

127. State licensing laws place regulatory responsibility in a single State agency depending on the nature of the service being licensed and the State agency having primary responsibility and knowledge in the area.

128. The licensing authority have the right to make the initial determination of whether an agency is or is not included in the licensing provision.

129. The standards for day care facilities be reviewed and strengthened on the national, State, and local levels by representatives of health, education, and welfare organizations, both public and private.

130. State licensing laws prescribe that minimum and desirable standards be promulgated by the licensing authority.

131. The protections of licensing be extended to all children who need them, eliminating exemptions such as kind of auspices, age of children, or size of the group.

132. State legislation require public agencies to meet the same standards as those required of licensed agencies.

With respect to

RESEARCH

We recommend that:

133. Research be made on the effects of various types of day care in view of the lack of evaluated experience on the results of separation of mother and child as opposed to parental deprivation.

134. Research be made to determine what is needed and the costs of providing a licensing service, including kinds of personnel, workloads, and numbers of staff in relation to performance expectations and to enable communities to decide what they want and are willing to support.

135. Research be made to determine the needs and cost of providing a licensing service to include personnel workloads, and numbers of staff.